THE

MODERN CHURCHMAN

By identifying the new learning with heresy, you make orthodoxy synonymous with ignorance.—*Erasmus.*

A State without the means of change is without the means of its conservation.—*Edmund Burke.*

Nos. 7, 8 & 9. OCTOBER—DECEMBER, 1942. Vol. XXXII.

SIGNS OF THE TIMES

Hats off to the Archbishops.

St. Paul wrote to his Corinthian converts :

> 'Every woman praying or preaching with her head uncovered dishonoureth her head' (*I Cor.* xi, 5).

Nearly half a century ago, Antoinette Stirling, the Victorian singer, commenting on these words, said, 'That is where Paul and I disagree.' Disagreement by modern women has been growing for years past, and at many religious gatherings, especially those of students, young women have ceased to wear anything on their heads when taking part in devotional exercises or when delivering addresses.

Our Archbishops of Canterbury and York cannot, therefore, be rightly charged with premature action by their recent pronouncement permitting women and girls to appear hatless in church. It is true that the custom revoked is both Apostolic and Catholic and has nineteen centuries of Christian practice behind it. It is true, also, that the Nicene Canon (325 A.D.) runs :

> 'Let the ancient customs prevail.'

Yet how many Apostolic, Catholic, and ancient customs practised in the Christian Church have been abandoned in the long course of the Church's history, and how many new customs have been substituted for them !

For the most part, this abandonment has not been episcopally authorised. The almost imperceptible influence of a changing environment has brought it about. We are glad, however, that our Archbishops have had the courage to authorize the change publicly and definitely. It is a sign to those who think that the words sung in church, 'as it was in the beginning, is now and ever shall be,'

are not in praise of the eternal faithfulness of God, but are an affirmation of the unchanging conservatism of Christian thought and practice. What our Church authorities have accomplished in so small a matter, seems to us to promise changes in matters of more importance.

The *Church Times* (November 13, p. 611) questions the authority of the Archbishops in this matter:

> 'Much more questionable is the manner in which the ruling has been promulgated. It is rather startling for the two Archbishops, even after consulting other diocesans, to issue a pronunciamento regulating the dress of worshippers and altering traditional Catholic custom. The Archbishops have no lawful authority on such questions outside their own dioceses, and their present declaration is only a theological opinion of Dr. Temple and Dr. Garbett.'

It should be noted, however, that what the Archbishops have done is to issue a permission, not a command — a permission which will serve two useful purposes. (1) It allows sensitive women to practise without *malaise* what they know is reasonable and right; and (2) it effectively prevents Church officials excluding women from any English Church where they desire to worship with heads uncovered.

Compulsory Communism, Class War, and Christianity.

The first pamphlet, entitled *Christians in the Class Struggle*,* issued by the Council of Clergy and Ministers for Common Ownership, is significant. The society which publishes this pamphlet has Dr. Blunt, the Bishop of Bradford, as its President; and the Rev. Gilbert Cope of Birmingham is its Secretary. The Society was founded as the result of a conference held at Leicester in May, 1942. The main aim of the society is:

> 'to integrate the activities of clergy and ministers who believe that they ought to play an active part in the change from private ownership to common ownership, which is the next stage of our national economic and political evolution.'

The following extracts from *Christians in the Class Struggle* will indicate the scope and spirit of this movement: our first quotation is from the Bishop of Bradford's Foreword and the four following are from the pamphlet itself:

> (1) 'Our present economic system is immoral and un-Christian. Its appeal is nakedly to self-interest; its technique is economic competition. It leads to the exploitation of the weak by the strong, it promotes mass-selfishness, class-division, and international war. It is a worship of Mammon, and, as such, is a moral outrage.
>
> 'This being so, it is part of the Church's duty to God to say so, at whatever risk of antagonising those whose vested interests lie in the main-

* *Christians in the Class Struggle,* by Rev. Gilbert Frederick Cope. Published by the Council of Clergy and Ministers for Common Ownership (C.C.M.C.O.), 1942. 6*d*.

tenance of this system. The Son of God was manifested to destroy the works of the devil, and when something is so plainly a work of the devil, both in its principles and in its effects, nothing can excuse a minister of Christ from working for its destruction.

'The private ownership of the means of production is the nerve-centre of the system. To attack it is to attack the particular point at which the immorality of the system is most manifest and most corrosive' (*Foreword*).

(2) 'If it is right for English democrats to fight against German fascists, precisely the same sort of justification is involved when fellow-nationals become opposed to each other in the world struggle to abolish capitalism. The concern of Christians in every case is that the duration and intensity of strife shall be reduced to the minimum consistent with the establishment of conditions in which God's will upon earth may best be done, whether it be in a war of liberation or in a revolution' (p. 15).

(3) 'The vital question which faces all those who desire the establishment of common ownership, and particularly the Christians among them, is the method by which the revolution will be completed. Is a substantial majority in Parliament, on the present electoral system, all that is necessary? Is it possible to "nationalise" piecemeal one aspect after another of our economic life? Is it to be expected that the members of the present "ruling class" will be peaceably converted to views diametrically opposed to those which they now hold? Does history bear out the assumption that men do good when they have been taught how to recognise it? Is it conceivable that common ownership could be established if in Parliament there were a permanent opposition, representative of the owners, thwarting every move towards common ownership and powerfully working for the re-establishment of private ownership? Is it not obvious that if we are to have socialism — real and permanent socialism — all the fundamental opposition must be "liquidated" (*i.e.* rendered politically inactive by disfranchisement, and if necessary by imprisonment)?' (pp. 17-18).

(4) 'The important matter of how opposition is to be nullified depends upon the methods adopted by the opposition itself — if constitutional methods were used by the opposition they could be dealt with by processes of law, imprisonment, etc. It would be a "shooting" revolution only if the opposition started the shooting. In other words, the degree of force and the actual methods of enforcement would depend upon the strength and general policy of the counter-revolutionaries' (p. 18).

(5) 'According to Marxist theory, religion is a hindrance to the growth of the workers' understanding of the nature of the class-conflict, and therefore to the change from private ownership to common ownership, because historically, since the Reformation, the Church has nearly always sanctioned class-collaboration and regarded as sinful any rebellion against established government. (This practical matter is reflected philosophically in the difference between religious idealism and dialectical materialism.) When it can be shown by Christians that their faith leads them to revolutionary action (in the sense of *Magnificat*), and when, as a consequence of their belief in the loving justice of God and the essential brotherhood of man, they work for an economically classless society, then it may well be that part of the present opposition of Christianity and Marxism will be resolved' (p. 22).

This clericalist organization, created to promote compulsory Communism, should it receive any large measure of support among the English clergy and ministers of religion, may prove as detrimental to the State as to the Church. To brand Capitalism

as a 'deadly sin'—and so by inference to condemn our present economic and social system as unChristian—is the wrong way for Christians to proceed if they desire to advance still further the remarkable practical policy of social betterment and economic reform which has characterized our national life during the twentieth century. The suggestion that Communists in this country may have to resort to arms and bloodshed as a final step in the accomplishment of their aims is as provocative as it is sinister. Any impartial study of our recent policies of social, economic, and political reform, which disclose a wonderful record of progress, will not dare to suggest any methods of advance other than constitutional ones based on appeals addressed to the good sense and good feeling of our countrymen. That is the English way, as it is also the Christian way, of securing reform.

To parade compulsory Communism as Christian is unsound historically. The Primitive Christian Church in Jerusalem was communist, but its Communism was entirely voluntary, and was the product of fervent Christian love. Its voluntary character is shown by the words addressed by St. Peter to Ananias:

> 'While it remained was it not thine own; and after it was sold was it not in thine own power?' (*Acts* v, 4).

It would seem, however, that this voluntary Communism was not a success. The Church of Jerusalem fell into poverty, and the Christian community there were known as the 'poor saints' and would seem to have been dependent upon contributions made by their fellow-Christians who belonged to non-Communist Churches. There is no trace of Communism in any other of the Christian Churches of the early centuries. The Christian Communist ideal, however, was realized later in the various Monastic Orders of the Christian Church whose members, inspired by Christian ideals of love and poverty, had all things in common, and in many cases became so rich that they gave of their abundance to numerous charitable and religious purposes.

Here, however, it ought to be noted that it was only those Christians who had renounced all domestic ties and family responsibilities who were admitted as members into these Communist Christian Societies. Outside these Monastic Orders, Communism has not characterized the Christian Church. At the period of the Reformation, the Anabaptists advocated Communism, but were given little opportunity to realize it by their fellow-Christians, whether of the Roman Catholic or Reformed Churches.

The Jesuit Missionaries would seem to have introduced Communism among their Indian converts in South America, but with no great success. Since the days of the French Revolution, non-Christian communities have led in attempts to realize or rather

enforce the Communist ideal. The strongest objection to modern Communism would seem to be that voluntary Communism having broken down (save in the Monastic Orders), Communism can only be realized by compulsion. This makes Communism the enemy of freedom.

Archbishop Magee declared that he would rather see England free than England sober, and it is clear that the vast majority of English people would rather have England free than England communist. Judicious compromise is the key-note of English policy, and a combination of compromises constitutes the Englishman's political paradise. It must be obvious to any except the most fanatical of political and economic doctrinaires that there are a number of ways by which economic poverty, chronic unemployment, cut-throat competition, the tyranny of monopolist combines and class privilege, can be eliminated from our national life without resort to the steamroller of compulsory Communism. There are values of initiative, energy, and many-sided achievement in economic competition, the profit motive, private ownership, which we need to preserve in our national life, but which would be lost by the establishment of compulsory Communism.

Our present policy of strengthening public social services for the elimination of chronic unemployment, economic poverty and ill-health, and of vastly improving and extending our system of national education, together with the unflinching insistence on *une carrière ouverte aux talents* for every member of our community is the best and surest way of eliminating class barriers, not by levelling down but by levelling up. This policy seems to us, both in its methods and ideals, to have much more affinity with the Christian religion than the Bishop of Bradford's root and branch Communist tyranny.

The Straight Answer.

The Wise Man has told us that 'a soft answer turneth away wrath,' but he has not told us anything about a straight answer—possibly because the wise in the East never make use of it.

In the Church of England it is still otherwise. At a recent gathering of religious representatives many attempts were made to answer the question: 'What is wrong with the Church of England?' A clergyman rose and said: 'What is wrong with the Church is that the clergy will not give straight answers to straight questions.'

This, however, is not always the case. An army chaplain, reported to the authorities for teaching heresy, was sent for by his senior chaplain, who said to him: 'I have to put the four following questions to you and require you to answer them with

a simple yes or no.'

'1. Do you believe in the Incarnation?
2. Do you believe in the Virgin Birth?
3. Do you believe in the Resurrection?
4. Do you believe in Miracles?'

To questions 1 and 3 the examinee answered, 'Yes.' To questions 2 and 4 he answered, 'No.' His senior replied: 'You are a brave man. You will hear no more about this from me, but I was required by the authorities to put these questions to you.'

This case is particularly significant, for it indicates, so we interpret it, that our Church authorities are prepared to allow dogmatic freedom to the clergy up to the limits exhibited by the *Doctrinal Report*. It suffices that a clergyman should believe in the *fact* of Christ's Incarnation and in the *fact* of Christ's Resurrection, but he is left free to believe as he thinks best about the *mode* of the incarnation and the *mode* of the resurrection.

Professor Joad as an Ecclesiastical Physician.

Under the heading, 'Prospects of Religion,' in the *New Statesman* of August 22 and 29, Prof. Joad dealt with the existing religious situation in this country. The Sir Oracle of the Brains Trust remarks of a recent discussion with the leaders of all the great religious denominations (except the Roman Catholic):

> 'I do not remember to have talked with a more bewildered group of men.'

He regards the existing religious situation as 'intriguing' and is convinced that

> 'beneath the crust of surface indifference an undirected spiritual ferment is at work.'

The view that human evil or sin can be effectively abolished by the elimination of economic poverty and by the cure of psychological complexes, neuroses and obsessions, Prof. Joad holds, is losing ground with many to-day. Human sin, it would appear, is too deeply ingrained to be abolished simply by these means. Is it possible that it is only religion, with its practice of prayer and its reliance on Divine grace, which can effect this abolition of sin or at least its progressive conquest? Another factor which Prof. Joad notes in the spiritual ferment of to-day is that the materialistic view of the universe is being replaced by a non-material, possibly even by a spiritual conception of its reality. This change in our mental environment has cleared the ground for the re-entry of religion into our personal and social life. The question therefore is now: What kind of religion and how is it to enter?

Prof. Joad does not hold that the organized Churches stand much chance of becoming vehicles of the religion of which the growing need is being felt.

> 'Figures recently compiled by Mass Observation show that while 5 per cent. of the population go oftener to Church than they did before the war, there is an increase of 21 per cent. in the number of those who never go at all.'

Prof. Joad further notes a not less significant fact that

> 'the group of clergymen with whom I had the benefit of discussing the situation described the various devices which they and others had tried to bring people, and especially young people, into the churches. On the whole they must, they agreed, be written off as failures. Whatever methods people are adopting to strengthen and comfort themselves under the troubles and difficulties that press increasingly upon them, they are not having recourse to the organised churches.'

Hence Prof. Joad concludes that

> 'the Churches are at the parting of the ways. Either they will fade altogether from the national life, and become wholly, what many are in large part already, empty shells, or they may come once again to assume importance in the lives of men. If they are to do so, they must, I suggest, develop on one or other of two lines.'

The first of Prof. Joad's two lines is that of practical Christian Communism. This involves, as Prof. Joad understands it, equalization of the incomes of the clergy, Disestablishment of the Church, the elimination of private profit from industry, and so on.

Prof. Joad's second line is the practice of Christian mysticism and other-worldliness. This method assumes that although the individual soul can be saved, human society cannot. The Christian's attitude towards the world must be that of the apostolic exhortation :

> 'Come out from among them and touch not the unclean thing and ye shall be my sons and daughters, saith the Lord Almighty' (*II Cor.* vi, 17, 18).

In brief, it is the escapism of those who are fleeing from the City of Destruction to the Celestial City. This 'escape' can be made by man as an individual or as a member of an ecclesiastical community. Prof. Joad combines this escapism with the acceptance of supernatural dogmas which refuse to make concessions to modern knowledge and modern thought.

We doubt if either of Prof. Joad's prescriptions is sound, although both are popular in ecclesiastical circles to-day. A Communist society in Great Britain, if we are not to be plunged into dire economic poverty, can only be created and maintained by an iron discipline which is as opposed to British ideals of personal and political freedom as it is opposed to those of Christian liberty. Poverty, unemployment and other economic and social ills can, so many British citizens believe, be most satisfactorily remedied by the judicious, courageous and generous development of our public social services. These methods are both in accordance with our national genius as well as in harmony with a world-embracing and world-consecrating Christianity.

As regards the mystical prescription, let it be said at once, that there can be no Christian Religion without mysticism, which is only another term for the soul's conscious relationship to God and the endeavour to make the consciousness of that relationship the supreme authority in our personal life. But there is not the slightest need either on the one hand to unite this Christian mysticism to a static and arrogant ecclesiastical traditionalism, or on the other hand to unite it to a world-renouncing escapism. John Keble's familiar recipe is as characteristic of English good sense as it is of the sober temper of English Christian practice.

> 'We need not bid, for cloistered cell,
> Our neighbour and our work farewell,
> Nor strive to wind ourselves too high
> For sinful man beneath the sky:
>
> The trivial round, the common task,
> Should furnish all we ought to ask,—
> Room to deny ourselves, a road
> To bring us daily nearer God.'

The remedies which we are moved to suggest for increasing Christian influence among British people to-day are less drastic and revolutionary than those visualized by Prof. Joad. May we once more reiterate them?

(1) The Christian Church must show men that there is no real conflict between the essentials of the Christian religion and the fundamental convictions of human reason, and that it is possible to be both religious and reasonable at the same time. It is absurd to strive to develop national Christian education unless this postulate be accepted. Hence, we must continue to re-state our Christian dogmas so as, on the one hand to preserve their essential truth, and on the other hand to separate that essential truth from combination with various traditional errors, which render the essential truth incredible to people of modern education.

(2) We must develop and strengthen our systems of Christian education in this country so as to produce Christian conduct and character in every pupil. We talk about creating a Christian atmosphere in our schools. This is no doubt desirable, but it is only a means to the real end, the creation of Christian character in the pupils. Whether such pupils will flow into the churches will depend upon the Christian character of the churches themselves.

(3) We must advance on the path of Christian Reunion, and that not simply by the use of fraternal phrases combined with denominational rivalries, but, by common worship and practical Christian co-operation which ignores the demand that all Christians must be agreed on a number of dogmatic, ecclesiastical, institutional, and liturgical *data* before they can unite in one great

Christian Fellowship for common worship and practical co-operation.

These things are not easy to achieve. Mountains of prejudice, abysses of ignorance, torrents of fanaticism have to be overcome, to say nothing of the sloth and indifference, the materialism and selfishness which always thwart and beset any Christian movement which is onward and upward.

DEMOCRACY IS NOT ENOUGH.

We are all democrats to-day, for the cause of the Allies is the cause of Democracy. By Democracy we mean what Abraham Lincoln meant, 'Government of the people, by the people, for the people.' Great stress must be laid on the phrase 'the people,' for one of the greatest enemies of Democracy is *sectionalism*, that is identifying with 'the people' one particular class or interest or political leader, and endeavouring to govern wholly or solely for the advantage of this particular class or interest or leader, in the name of Democracy. In such cases Demagogy is called in to deceive Democracy, and the exploited people as a whole is held up to ransom to secure the policy and profits of one section. Besides its tendency to sectionalism, another weakness of Democracy is its *instability*. No student of the history of Democracy can fail to note this weakness. What the Burial Service wrote of man is not less true of Democracy:

> 'He cometh up as it were a flower and is cut down, he fleeth as it were a shadow and never continueth in one stay.'

That far-sighted and fearless historian Lecky did little more than rouse the incredulity of the democratic Western world when, towards the end of the nineteenth century, he pointed out that there were signs that Western Democracy was threatened, and threatened, not by tyrants, whether monarchical, aristocratic or ecclesiastical, but by its own inherent weakness — the forces of disintegration within it. These disintegrating forces are disunion and corruption.

It was the Greeks in their City-state who first developed and realized the democratic ideal. Yet for every lover of Democracy how bitterly disappointing is the history of Greek Democracy. When at last it was overthrown everywhere in that ancient world there was only one verdict possible — 'it richly deserved its fate.'

Are we not to-day compelled to deliver the same verdict as we contemplate the overthrow of French Democracy? The disunity and corruption in the political and social life of France in the years before the *debâcle* of 1940 permit no other judgment.

What are our feelings in the presence of American and British Democracy to-day? We are told that Democracy is on its trial.

Never was a truer word spoken, yet many of our most vociferous champions of Democracy do not seem to be aware of its critical situation. Should a political disaster overtake the great Democratic states, Democracy as a practical, political system would be kicked from its place to lie in the limbo of things which in this world's history are dead to name and fame and use. To-day the fate of Democracy trembles in the balance, threatened once again by its two great enemies, disunion and corruption — the products of that human selfishness and folly which is ever ready to believe that the interests of the whole can be safely sacrificed in the interests of the individual, or a group of individuals within the whole, provided that such sectional selfishness be camouflaged as democratic.

Hence, to the disintegrating forces of disunity and corruption, we have to add self-deception — self-deception propagated in the old Democracies by popular oratory, supplemented tenfold in the modern Democracies by the popular press and wireless. Disunion, corruption, self-deception — these are Democracy's three inherent enemies to its stability, permanence and power of development: a power of development which can only be secured by loyalty to high ideals. Democracy which sinks to the level of believing that it has realized its ideal by 'fattening men as though they were hogs' — to quote the judicious Hooker — will quickly find that the butcher is in the background eager to terminate its comfortable materialistic existence.

We have here touched on what perhaps is the greatest *crux* of Democracy. Democracy, of all forms of human government, is the most difficult to realize practically, and that is because the democratic ideal is not static but progressive, and because progressive, dynamic. Its ideal objective always lies ahead and recedes with every advance. Hence the self-realization of Democracy makes a tremendous demand on a community which has selected to be governed democratically. It seems to be popularly supposed that Democracy is the easiest kind of government to achieve — very little more is demanded than a political revolution, preferably a bloodless one, combined with re-distribution of rights and property. When this has been done the ideal has been attained and nothing more is required than to guard what has been secured. This, alas! is almost invariably the bureaucrat's idea of democratic government — uniformity combined with stagnation. As we see it, this kind of democratic government must be followed quite quickly by democratic death. It is only the Democracy which is devoted to progressive, democratic self-realization that can survive, and survive with increasing benefit, to the democratic community.

What is required in a Democracy in order to secure this intensely difficult and exacting quality of progressive self-realization? Our intellectuals will reply: education. When the democratic franchise was extended in this country, Lord Salisbury commented, 'We shall have to educate our masters.'

This advice is worth little unless we are clear as to the kind of education demanded. We are convinced that the education of the citizen in democratic ideals and methods has to be supplemented by education in theocratic ideals and methods. If Democracy is to be cured of its inherent weaknesses as a system of government, it must be fused with Theocracy. When Josephus, the Jewish historian, the contemporary of St. Paul, sought to define precisely for the Graeco-Roman world the Jewish form of government, he coined a new term for it and called it *Theocracy*—government by God. This government was administered in accordance with a Divine Law which had been given to Israel by divinely-inspired law-givers, judges and prophets. The obligation to learn this law, obey it, and instruct others in it, was imposed upon every Israelite whether king or peasant (*Deut.* vi, 6, 7). Thus was secured the democratic administration of a theocratic ideal of government. This theocratic law enunciated ideals and principles which cut at the root of the inherent weaknesses of Democracy. Loyalty to God and his law was the inspiration of all those civic, social, economic, and domestic duties which secured the welfare and stability of the community as a whole. Thus was the religious motive invoked to strengthen moral conviction and practice. Ideally every Israelite was himself both a king and a priest—an extraordinary instance of levelling up rather than levelling down in the interest of democratic government. When Prof. Ernest Barker said our English educational system needs not one Eton but a thousand Etons he was loyal to the true Democracy which strives to realize its ideal by levelling up. Democracy must be united to Theocracy if Democracy is to be constantly inspired by the spirit of disinterested service, fearless sincerity, self-disciplined freedom, corporate fellowship and self-sacrificing courage. This fusion of Theocracy and Democracy has been the inspiration of our English prophetic politicians such as Richard Hooker, John Milton, Edmund Burke, Thomas Arnold, Frederick Denison Maurice; and if we cross the Atlantic, we can detect it in the ideals of Abraham Lincoln and James Russell Lowell.

> 'God's price is high,' sez he:
> 'But nothin' else than wut He sells
> Wears long, an' thet J.B.
> May larn, like you an' me!'
>
> ('Jonathan to John' in *The Biglow Papers.*)

MODERN DOUBT AND THE RENAISSANCE OF RELIGION*

By F. Victor Fisher, Editor of *Religions*.

FEW people will deny that the world is passing through a revolutionary crisis in the most fundamental ideas on which Western civilization is based and on which it has developed.

National hereditary kingship has become a mere symbol where it has not been destroyed. Parliamentary Government, Republicanism, Democracy, Socialism, Communism, Individual Enterprise, Dictatorships — all are in the melting-pot. The Church is split into a hundred fragments. Doctrines at one time accepted without question are openly challenged. The traditions of the *bourgeoisie* have followed the traditions of the aristocracy into the limbo. An infallible Bible is no more accepted than an infallible Church. The ethical foundations of the social order are being undermined. On even some of the basic inductions of science doubt is now thrown. Man is reeling along a rough route with little but the remnants of ancient traditions and canons of conduct to enable him to keep erect.

If anyone thinks that this is an over-coloured picture, I would refer him to the twenty years of crass stupidity and instability, lacking alike in spiritual inspiration or practical guidance, which stretched between the two world wars. How many among the hundreds of millions of people who were being swept towards the cataclysm anticipated the destruction of the material and religious values such as has been wrought in the last three years? The story is one of unspeakable horror, ineptitude, ignorance, lack of imagination and criminal egotisms.

Among the ruins that lie all around us are those of an unquestioning faith in Christianity as revealed in the Bible and in the Creeds — a religion which proclaimed the loving-kindness of a personal Creator and the duty of his creatures to their God and to each other under pains and penalties too awful to imagine.

> 'They that have done good shall go into life everlasting; and they that have done evil into everlasting fire. This is the Catholic faith, which unless a man believe faithfully, he cannot be saved.' (*Quicunque Vult.*)

Although the changes in social and political thought have become more marked during the last two or three decades, the

* An address delivered at the first meeting of a Conference on 'The Decay of Religious Faith and Worship in the Western World,' under the auspices of the Society for the Study of Religions, at Livingstone Hall, Westminster, on October 14th, 1942. Chairman: Professor J. H. Sleeman, M.A.

religious revolution has been more subtle and has been going on for a much longer period. It is that fact which renders rather ridiculous the ecclesiastical recalls to religion which, while declaiming against the contemporary disregard of the spiritual life, deliberately ignore the root causes of that neglect. What are they?

Orthodox Catholicism and, later on, orthodox Protestantism, were complete systems of theology within the canons of knowledge in the days when the Western world successively gathered round their respective banners. Allegory was interpreted in terms of historical fact. God created man and woman and placed them in the Garden of Eden. They were tempted by Satan and ate of the Tree of Knowledge and were consequently expelled from Paradise. For that act of disobedience, for which woman was primarily responsible, God in His infinite mercy condemned all mankind. But later He relented and sent His only begotten Son, miraculously born of a Virgin, who became a ransom that he who believeth in Him should not perish but have everlasting life. The Eternal Father, appeased by the precious blood sacrificed on Calvary, caused His Son to rise bodily from the dead and thereby gave promise of immortal life to His children, whose sins, though they were as scarlet, should become as white as snow. The faithful dead should rise in their bodies as Christ had risen, and join the Lord in the clouds, while those who rejected Him would be cast into hell fire. Until the Day of Judgment His Church would remain a witness to God on earth, the guardian and interpreter of His Word — the Holy Bible.

Such, in skeleton outline, was the exoteric libretto of the grand drama of the Creation, the Fall and Salvation, as it was woven together and later on summarized in the Creeds. Meanwhile, chiefly through Egyptian, Hellenic and Asiatic influences, to God Transcendent in the Person of the Father and to God in Christ the Redeemer, was added God Immanent in the Holy Spirit, thus defining the mysterious doctrine of the Trinity — Three Persons in one God.

> 'And in this Trinity none is afore, or after other: none is greater, or less than another; but the whole three Persons are co-eternal together: and co-equal.' (*Quicunque Vult.*)

For eighteen centuries this astonishing amalgam of fable, folklore, allegory, Messianism, metaphysics, eschatology and historic facts held the Western world in a hypnotic power against which the forces of reason, philosophy and science strove in vain. To examine the foundations of this immense edifice of heretical Judaism and pagan legend was the most heinous of sins. To criticize the architectural superstructure, the most pernicious of crimes. Whatever else men did throughout the long-drawn-out 'Ages of Faith' and darkness, they never doubted the doctrines of the

popular faith once the dogmatic outline was clearly drawn in its vindication against the Gnostic and other heresies.

But I should be presenting a distorted picture if I advanced the view that this was the sole content of the Church's faith. There was another and far more precious and enduring aspect — I refer to the ethical message of Christianity.

Seven centuries before, the long line of Hebrew *nabis* or magic-workers and *fakirs* had reached the apex of its development in the great Writing Prophets. These men hated the growing urbanization, wealth and luxury of Israel. They feared and detested the effects of the increasing intermingling of the Hebrews with the Canaanitish peoples who surrounded and infiltrated them. They hated the Temple priesthood, its gorgeous ritual and its animal sacrifices.

> 'I hate, I despise your feast days, and I will not smell in your solemn assemblies . . . burnt offerings and meat offerings I will not accept. . . .' (*Amos* v, 21, 22.)

> 'I desired mercy and not sacrifice; and the knowledge of God more than burnt offerings.' (*Hosea* vi, 6.)

They loathed the growing familiarity of the Israelites with the heathen deities, their henotheism, their fertility cults and their tendencies towards phallic excesses.

> 'But ye have borne the tabernacle of your Moloch and Chiun your images, the star of your gods, which ye made to yourselves.' (*Amos* v, 26.)

They associated the increasing taxation of the common people with the voluptuous lives of their petty sultans and pashas, resented it and did not recognize it as the inevitable result of the change from a nomadic to an agricultural and urban civilization.

The prophets yearned to recall the primitive virility of the nomadic tribesmen devoted to their tribal god, Yahweh.

> 'For Israel hath forgotten his Maker, and buildeth temples; and Judah hath multiplied fenced cities; but I will send a fire upon his cities, and it shall devour the palaces thereof.' (*Hosea* viii, 14.)

They became the first Socialist agitators of whom we have record, and they bequeathed to the as yet unconceived Christian religion (perhaps largely through Essenism) the main principles and ideas of the later Christian poverty doctrines, the equalitarianism that waged for centuries a long fight within the Church, the hatred for the rich because they were rich, the pleas for the lowly and down-trodden, and the denunciation of interest-bearing loans.

> 'He is a merchant, the balances of deceit are in his hand; he loveth to oppress.' (*Hosea* xii, 7.)

These strange men were the forerunners of the Christian anchorites, the original inspirers of Christian asceticism and monastic celibacy, the pioneers who planted the fecund seeds of mercy and charity in a world in which the prize was to the strong and

unscrupulous, the race to the swift. These were the great souls who actually outlined the elementary principles of the humanism and revolutionary ideologies which still lay in the womb of the future. The great prophets conceived the idea of a Universal Deity who overleapt the narrow confines of Israel, a conception which, broadened and deepened by Zoroastrian influence, prepared the way for the Messianic message of Jesus. Thereafter, with the achievements of the Gentile Missions, the fertilizing spirit of prophetic Judaism flowed in hundreds of channels throughout the Roman world, mingling with and absorbing much of the pagan folk-lore as it became in turn infused with Hellenic mysticism. The social effects of the poverty evangel in Christianity showed in the periodic outbursts throughout the centuries, in violent agitations like the movement of John Ball, the Socialist priest of Chaucer's day; the uprising under the German Anabaptists, and the disturbances of the Levellers during the Commonwealth. In the nineteenth century a similar urge produced the gentler gospel of Christian Socialism. As John Ball asked,

> 'When Adam delved and Eve span,
> Who was then a gentleman?'

The implied indictment of trade morality and loans on interest, running throughout long spans of Christian history, has recently been revived in eminent ecclesiastical circles. 'The problem scarcely existed in the days when the first Christian community held all things in common,' says Coulton. Later on, the Church — the most powerful *landowner* of the time — adopted towards the rising *commercial* interests an attitude of active hostility. Sir William Ashley shows that Tertullian, Jerome, Augustine and St. John Chrysostom all opposed the taking of interest on loans. St. Thomas Aquinas laid it down that trading has a certain baseness but is not necessarily vicious. The theory of Canon Law was against the acceptance of interest. It is hardly necessary to add that the Church was at times among the greatest 'sinners' in this matter.

The total failure of the repeated denunciations of inescapable economic laws by the Church during the Ages of Faith should be sufficient warning to those who seek to override or arrest the time-spirit of social development. Love, mercy and charity cannot be enforced by Parliamentary enactments nor kept alive by bureaucratic ukases. To give voluntarily is one thing, but compulsion to surrender is quite another. There can be no moral responsibility where there is no individual freedom: there can be no personal freedom without personal risks, and even economic security will be dearly purchased at the price of liberty.

The impartial critic must indeed agree that Christianity did implant a higher ethic in the mind of man than even that reached

by the Stoic and Platonic philosophies. As Professor H. G. Wood has pointed out recently, the classical social outlook, broadly speaking, was aristocratic, whereas Christianity was democratic. Loisy asserts it is unthinkable that the modern world should reject Christian humanism to go back to the form of humanism which was abandoned by the classical world. Yet the inspiration given by Jesus was not primarily to save civilization, but to save men and women.

> 'It is impossible,' says Wood, 'to reduce Christianity to a *this-world* religion or to equate the Kingdom of God with an ideal social order or a given social programme.'

After all, with a mental outlook of the primitive Christians which anticipated the early collapse of all earthly government, Jesus could not have contemplated laying the foundations of an enduring social order. His Kingdom was not of this world.

Four centuries after the Crucifixion the dogmatic foundations of the Catholic edifice were firmly established and, apart from the Great Schism in the eleventh century which permanently divided East and West, Christendom passed into the night of the Dark Ages. The Eastern Orthodox Church became sterile in the static culture of Byzantium; the Latin Church controlled the slow growth of the new polities which grew out of the ruins of the Western Empire.

In the fifteenth century occurred four events of outstanding importance to the future of European culture. In 1438 Gutenberg realized his invention of movable type for printing: 1453 witnessed the end of the Byzantine Empire through the conquest of Constantinople by Mohammed II: in 1492 Columbus discovered the New World: about the same time Copernicus revolutionized the whole human outlook on the relation of the earth to the solar system and stellar space. From these four momentous events followed in due course the full flowering of the renaissance of Western learning. Monkish scribes and priestly dogmatists were no longer able to limit the circulation of classical writings to laboriously hand-copied parchment manuscripts, in which clerical and literary honesty were frequently set at naught. Above all, the Bible appeared in the vernacular as well as in Latin and Greek in many hundreds and even thousands of copies, and was studied throughout the Western world by the educated classes. Henceforth nothing could impede the unfoldment of the New Learning. Human thought was stirred in a hundred directions, but nowhere more strikingly than in the region of theology. At first the Bible was studied strictly within the canon of orthodox thought and current knowledge. But the germ of latitudinarianism, culminating in scepticism, was implicit in the Protestant right of private judgment. Simultaneously philosophy began to draw devastating

inferences from the New Learning. First among these was the application by Giordano Bruno of the Copernican discoveries to arguments in favour of the infinity of worlds. Thereafter there arose a long succession of profound and brilliant philosophers who explored the highest realms of abstract truth, untrammelled by theological dogmas or prejudices. Such names as Bacon, Hobbes, Descartes, Spinoza, Locke, Leibnitz, Berkeley, Voltaire, Hume, Kant, Hegel and Comte are only those of the most famous in a great gallery of independent intellectual pioneers.

In the meantime positive science was developing with unprecedented rapidity, and profoundly affected man's outlook on life in all its ramifications. Geology shattered the former ecclesiastical teachings of the age of the earth. Biology and anthropology extended the existence of man on the globe to illimitable periods. Archaeology uncovered the remnants of forgotten civilizations far anterior to the beginnings of recorded history. Embryology, physiology and anatomy related man to other and diverse forms of animal life. Ethnology and philology shed a flood of light on racial development. The comparative study of religions continues to afford increasing evidence of the kinship between the different expressions of man's spiritual evolution. Biblical criticism has rendered for ever impossible, to the mind which is capable of weighing evidence, acceptance of the verbal inerrancy of the Old and New Testament narratives.

Yet the most modern thought declines to admit the dicta of positive science as the final verdict of human research on the meaning of life. Bergson has denied the ultimate validity of intellectual judgments and emphasizes the *élan vital*, irrational impulse, as the main factor in life. According to him, intuition is able to grasp ultimate reality, which rationalism only falsifies. The theory of relativity, as expounded principally by Einstein, has qualified Euclidian geometry.

> 'Whatever,' says a commentator, 'may be the final interpretation of the theory of relativity, one effect of the new physics has been to undermine the position of the New Realism.'

It may indeed be argued that in the higher realms of thought the old materialism is as dead as the old credulity.

> 'It may well be' (says Robert Arch) 'that our mental processes are invariably connected with physical or chemical changes in the brain. But it cannot be shown *why* movements of particles in the brain should produce that unique relation between ourselves and the external world which we call knowledge or awareness.'

If religion is to find its way to rebirth it must seek spiritualisation in a philosophic mysticism untarnished by 'sorcery' or 'magic.' There is a place for the intuitive in this life as well as for the rational functioning in the realm of the senses. Subjective experi-

ence cannot be locked out from the world of religion any more than from other aspects of the life of the *psyche*. As the artist conceives the idea of the work to be executed on canvas or in marble, as the composer hears the harmonies and melodies of his theme prior to committing them to paper, as the poet senses the subject of his thought before having recourse to language, so the souls who seek God may find Him through the Inner Light. It is not to be supposed, as J. B. S. Haldane has observed, that the brain secretes thought as the liver secretes bile. Says Dr. Inge in his brilliant study of Plotinus:

> 'Body, Soul and Spirit are respectively the world as perceived by the senses; the world interpreted by the mind as a spatial and temporal order; and the spiritual world.'

He goes on to say that the world is perceived under those three aspects by the bodily senses, by thought and by intuitive knowledge. Of these, the last alone perceives the world as it really is. According to Plotinus the phenomenal world is only an appearance, not possessing reality — like a shadow on a blind. The value of the soul and the world of the soul is purely derivative and dependent. The spiritual world is the only real world.

Whatever thought-forms may be consciously or unconsciously behind the modern mind either in its esoteric or exoteric character and quality, it is obvious that the old-time Catholic and Protestant dogmatic basis of the interpretation and explanation of human existence and destiny is no longer capable of offering any adequate unifying spiritual sanction for the social order. Nothing, indeed, could be conceived as more antithetical than the orthodox Christian scheme on the one hand and the independent metaphysical, philosophical and materialist theories which have broken away from the medieval unity of thought and ethics and, like many fissures in an ancient building, now threaten to bring the whole edifice crashing to the ground. Moreover, and perhaps most important, the intellectual, spiritual and social atmosphere of the modern order has completely outmoded that of the long centuries which witnessed the birth and growth of orthodox Christianity. Our cosmogony and cosmology are quite different from those of the first fourteen centuries of the Christian era. In pre-scientific days men expected miracles. Magic was part of the natural order of things. Sorcery and wizardry were the precursors of scientific methods. This element in the thought and conduct of primitive society is repellent to the educated modern mind. Nevertheless, as Frederick Harrison pointed out many years ago,

> 'the great founders of Catholic theology, such men as Gregory and Augustine, Aquinas and Anselm, were men of mighty intellect and, within their limits, of profound philosophical sagacity. The vast scheme which they built up out of the Bible and the Fathers was a coherent and organic whole, logical within the range of its premisses and with the canons of

thought then current. It falls to pieces when great central doctrines have tumbled down, or are felt to be unfit for the temper of the age. . . .'

How many of the educated laity still really believe in the Virgin Birth of Jesus, or in the resurrection of the *body* at the Last Judgment, or in the anthropomorphic god of Abraham and Moses, of Calvin or Bossuet? How much of the so-called Bible history is myth, folklore, allegory or parable? In what way did the man Jesus, after his crucifixion, death and bodily resurrection, ascend to Heaven, there to be merged mysteriously into the spiritual Trinitarian *personal* God-head? For the present-day untrained mind it is at the best an obscurantist and inadequate effort of Judaic and Hellenic thought during the first three centuries to embody in a definite synthesis the then warring theistic ideas.

Is it any exaggeration to say that for the great mass of unreflecting people these ideas have no relation to life as it is lived to-day, and that they have ceased to exercise any moral and spiritual authority over that ever-increasing mass? In the search for religious consolation, many people seek refuge in such unorthodox cults as Christian Science, Spiritualism, British Israelism, Faith Healing, Theosophy and other varied forms of faith.

Yet it must be borne in mind that during those first centuries figurative expression was very general among the people, nor was the Hebrew language adapted to philosophic or abstract thought. Parable or allegory was much more readily understood. The allegorical meaning has been called the soul of the sacred text; the literal meaning only its body. In the East, such symbolism, such imagery, were frequently used to conceal meaning. 'Why speakest thou to them in parables?' asked his disciples of Jesus. And the Master answered: 'Because it is given unto you to know the mysteries of the Kingdom of Heaven, but to them it is not given . . . because seeing they see not, and hearing they hear not, neither do they understand.' He was speaking of the uninitiated, of those 'outside the sanctuary.'

Humanity as a whole, however, cannot tolerate a merely negative attitude to the mystery of Life and Death and the Beyond. If it is forced to throw aside the trammels of outworn creeds, it still seeks solace and hope in extra-mundane sanctions. It still probes and probes for an explanation of human destiny. It cannot be too much regretted, therefore, that the Christian Faith has been so much bound up with the miraculous and the magical. For, stripped of the marvellous and the supernatural, the Christian drama is among the most inspiring and beautiful of the great allegories of mankind. The Eternal Mother, the Eternal Babe, the Holy Family, symbolical of the unending cycle of human life, the immemorial Cross, occult emblem of birth and death, of joy and pain, and the Divine Man — God Incarnate and Immanent — whose death and

resurrection typify the immortal truth of life emergent from death. Surely the great dilemma of the Church is to have to continue to fasten on to eternal verities a false historicity, as though *Hamlet* would be greater if it were an exact record, or *Paradise Lost* more true if accepted literally, or *The Pilgrim's Progress* more authentic if it were an actual biography. How many to-day accept the charming folk story of the Garden of Eden as historical? Why should they be asked to accept the magnificent legend of Moses seeking instructions from his God in a personal interview on a high mountain as a definite event? If the tremendous tragedy of Job is admittedly allegorical, why should the *whole* poignant story of Christ be received as factual? If the bodily translation of Elijah to heaven is symbolical, why should the bodily resurrection of Christ be accepted as an actual occurrence in human history? It is this continued insistence on giving to didactic narrative the character of fact which has done more ill service to religion than anything else, by forcing it into a needless antagonism with the widening horizon of man. Great poetry may be truer than any human records, and eternal truths have frequently been enshrined in obvious fable. A hard literalism and false realism are the deadly foes of an evolving and expanding faith.

It is in fact the folly of literalism that it has been the chief contributor to scepticism. Allegory has been accepted as history. A time arrived when it became essential to interpret the gods of Greece in terms of myth and fable. The Stoic Zeno thus explained Homer. Zeus is for him the Logos who orders all things. In Judaism the Jewish law was interpreted symbolically, and the same method was found among the Essenes. Philo was the chief protagonist of this method of interpretation. Greek criticism forced both Jews and Christians to have recourse to an identical process in explaining such folklore as the story of Babel, of the Serpent in Eden, or the Devil taking Jesus up into a high mountain, or the miracle of the feeding of the five thousand. Paul affirms that the legend of Abraham's two sons was an allegory (*Gal.* iv, 24). The literal meaning of some passages, according to Philo, leads to absurdity and impiety, and literal obedience to the precepts of the Torah would be preposterous. Origen followed the example of Philo in regard to the Christian Scriptures. Hippolytus allegorises the *Book of Daniel*. The story of Jonah is a fable. Jerome explained the ancient story of Leah and Rachel as the former representing Judaism and the latter Christianity. Augustine also contended that 'the letter killeth.' Bernard of Clairvaux allegorised the Canticles. Thomas Aquinas distinguished between the literal and the spiritual sense of narratives. It was not until the Reformed Churches rejected the wiser methods of the Catholic schools that Protestantism strongly insisted on the complete historicity, the

literal and verbal inerrancy, of the Bible. It is to this short-sightedness that a very great proportion of modern loss of faith may be attributed.

It is childish, however, to imagine that materialistic thought can make a *tabula rasa* of a synthesis of religious ideas and traditions stretching backwards thousands of years. The folklore of Christendom is rooted in the far distant past and was born of human needs, as it was the reflection of human strivings and hopes in the daybreak of our civilization. To destroy it would be sheer vandalism, as who would raze to the ground Chartres, or Canterbury, or Westminster, with the object of building on their sites really modern edifices replete with every contemporary amenity and convenience? It is true that 'when I was a child, I spake as a child, I understood as a child, I thought as a child; but when I became a man I put away childish things.' The adult mind rejects belief in fairy tales as facts; but, greatest of paradoxes, humanity cannot live without fairy tales. I plead, merely, that they should be recognized *as* fairy tales—the frequently touching and uplifting picture-writings of lessons true for all time.

In this sense, the great stories of the Bible are splendidly veracious, and this is the secret of the unfailing appeal they have made to human hearts. The Garden of Eden, the Serpent, the Deluge, the Tower of Babel, the quest of the Promised Land, the Law given on the mountain to Moses, the Holy City, the Messianic Hope, God Incarnate, Divinity in Man, Birth through love freed from lust, the Calvary of Life, the Crucifixion of Divinity in humanity, Life out of Death — they are all terrifyingly true, truer than all factual history.

The acceptance of such interpretations would end the false antithesis between science and religion. It would free mankind for the sublime task of moulding a fresh synthesis of spiritual faith which would link Past and Present. It would liberate humanity, blinded by the bigotry of literalism, to go forward on the grand route of Creative Evolution. The unique value of such an adaptation of modern knowledge to the expression of immutable truth on the spiritual and ethical planes would be that man's recognition of the Christ ideal would be preserved, not only unimpaired but strengthened. Jesus was not a myth, but a real man, around whose personality human needs and human credulity in ages of darkness have entwined myth, because otherwise the faith which sprang from the *character* of the Master could not have vanquished the variety of cults of which historical Christianity is a synthesis. Moreover, it was necessary, as has been admirably said, 'that the universal, eternal and ideal import of his personality should be delivered from the individual and social limitations of its temporal manifestation, and as the real principle of redemption should find

concrete expression in a form above the limitations of time. But what other form could have been found than the symbolic or allegoric language of myth?'

What conclusions, then, can we reach in the most general terms? That the teachings of Jesus have not an arbitrary, absolute value but must stand or fall by their relation to what have been called the eternal verities: that by this test they are in most instances demonstrably precious beyond compare: that the historicity and literal accuracy of many of the events which are recorded in the Gospels are not essential to a perpetuation of Christian spiritual ideals and Christian ethics: that the uninitiated who can only find sustenance and hope in anthropomorphic conceptions will still continue to do so, but that the initiated will understand that the value of the moral and religious allegory is at least not less than that of historical events—sometimes of much higher value. Those of us who can no longer believe that Jesus was raised from the dead and carried bodily up to his Father, the eternal God-head, or that this event constitutes the supreme essential assurance that we shall survive death, and that if this particular episode did not actually occur all hope of human survival is shattered, can still hold fast to our faith that Omniscient Intelligence exists beyond physical phenomena. We can still believe that within the mysterious web of existence the individual soul will go forward after this life to further and higher experiences of trial and growth. If the rigidly orthodox should retort that this open portal to a religious renaissance reveals no *certain* pathway beyond, I can only reply that whole masses of the younger generation have already turned aside from the orthodox road only to plunge into the dark bog of materialism, and of these it may truly be said 'Abandon hope all ye who enter here.'

Such interpretation and understanding as I have indicated have much to teach us whereby we may fill our new bottles with old wine, the divine elixir of renewed life. As Pfleiderer penetratingly put it:

> 'They show us how we ought to let history point the way above history to the eternal and omnipresent God, who is a God of the living and not of the dead; they warn us to free ourselves from the fatal ban of historicism, which seeks God's revelation only in the records of a dead past and thus loses the power of finding it in the living present. "Why seek ye the living among the dead? He is not here. He is risen! . . ." We are to behold the living Christ Spirit, this ever indwelling divine principle of mankind, everywhere where the souls of men open themselves to the knowledge of every truth, where hearts glow with enthusiasm for all that is good, where love fulfils its daily offering of self-sacrifice for the good of the community, where there is conflict and suffering for the cause of justice and righteousness in society, where there is faith in the continual coming of God's Kingdom among us, and where in this faith the world is overcome.'

ISAAC NEWTON: SCIENTIST AND THEOLOGIAN

By the Rev. G. L. Marriott, M.A., author of *Macarii Anecdota.*

THE tercentenary of the birth of Sir Isaac Newton falls on Christmas Day this year. Any one of Newton's three great discoveries — the composition of light, the law of gravitation, and the method of fluxions (differential calculus)—would have sufficed to make him famous. The effect which his brilliant discoveries in mathematics and physics had on his contemporaries is expressed in the well-known lines of a Roman Catholic poet, Alexander Pope :

> 'Nature and Nature's laws lay hid in night :
> God said "Let Newton be," and all was light.'

It is interesting to study the theology and religion of such a man, even though we may come to the conclusion that his *forte* lay elsewhere. He regarded both the starry universe and the Bible as fields in which marks of God's Providence could be traced. He saw phenomena in the universe which he thought not explicable by mere natural causes, but which inevitably point to the counsel and contrivance of a Supreme Mind. Time and again in his four letters to Dr. Bentley he had recourse to 'the Divine Arm,' without which the arrangement and movement of the celestial bodies would not, he said, be intelligible. One or two examples may be selected. In his First Letter he declared that he could not see how the sun by gravity could cause the diurnal motion of the planets :

> 'If the sun by his rays could carry about the planets, yet I do not see how he could thereby effect their diurnal motions.'
>
> 'In my former [*i.e.* the First Letter, which we have just cited] I represented that the diurnal rotations of the planets could not be derived from gravity, but required a Divine Arm to impress them.'

We cannot imagine Eddington or some other godly astronomer of the present day talking like this. Modern astronomers derive the diurnal rotation of the earth from the passing of a second star near the sun, and so from gravitation.

Newton proceeds to argue that gravity (which, it is interesting to note, he refused either to affirm or to deny as innate in matter) is inconsistent with the dispersal of matter evenly throughout the heavens without the intervention of a supernatural power, and concludes,

> 'and lest the systems of the fixed stars should, by their gravity, fall on each other, he hath placed those systems at immense distances from one another.'

This argument of Newton's is fallacious. No modern man of science would argue in this way. Modern astro-physicists find not

a supernatural power, but a natural power, to disperse matter in opposition to gravity. This is radiation, which must arise from sufficiently great accumulations of matter (above a tenth of the weight of the sun), and exerts a pressure on everything that absorbs or reflects it.

In general, Newton's arguments for Deity, derived from natural order, would be judged unsatisfactory by modern astronomers or astro-physicists. They amount, in fact, to ascribing events, the natural cause of which is unknown or unimagined, to Divine Power. It is preferable both scientifically and theologically to ascribe them to natural causes as yet unknown or unimagined: scientifically, for it encourages further research, while ascription to a Divine Power suggests that all is known that can or need be known; theologically, for atheists are committed to finding natural causes or none at all for everything, while theists find it undesirable to base a belief in God on ignorance of natural causes, and make God a mere *asylum ignorantiae*. There are other and better reasons for belief in the existence of God. There is a grave danger of Natural Theology crippling both science and theology. Eddington, if we understand him aright, thinks that beliefs about God must have other sources than science. The absence therefore from scientific text-books of any reference to Divine action and method must not be interpreted as due to the denial of such evidence by scientists, but is due to the restricted methods of research employed by them.

The attitude of the pure scientist in this matter is that of Laplace. When Napoleon said to him, after reading his *Méchanique Celeste*, 'I observe, monsieur, that in your work you make no reference to God.' 'No, Sire,' replied the French astronomer; 'I had no need of that hypothesis.' But theistic faith has need of such an hypothesis, and it is beyond the power of Science to pronounce it invalid.

The Unseen Divine Realities, so St. Paul affirmed (cf. *Rom.* i, 20), are clearly seen by mental reflection on the created universe, namely, the Divine Power and Godhead of the Creator. This was the line taken by Newton's contemporary, Addison, in his interpretation of the significance of the astronomical universe for religious faith—an interpretation as old as Psalm xix:

> 'The spacious firmament on high,
> With all the blue ethereal sky,
> And spangled heavens, a shining frame,
> Their great Original proclaim.
> . . . . .
>
> In reason's ear they all rejoice,
> And utter forth a glorious voice;
> For ever singing as they shine,
> "The hand that made us is Divine."'

We now turn to another aspect of Newton the theologian. Newton had a great reverence for the Bible, especially for its prophetic portions. Christianity in his opinion could be proved true because it is the fulfilment of biblical prophecy. The Christian religion, he declared, 'is founded on Daniel's prophecy concerning the Messiah.'[1] The coming of Christ was predicted by the prophets. When Christ came, it was evident to all who would candidly look into the matter that his advent and work had been foretold. Moreover, Newton found in the prophets

> 'the predictions of things to come relating to the state of the Church in all ages.[2] He regarded "the prophecies of the Old and New Testaments as given . . . that they might be interpreted by the event and afford convincing arguments that the world is governed by Providence."'[3]

This apologetic sounds strange to modern ears, because Newton was writing before the emergence of Biblical criticism. The *Book of Daniel* was taken by him at its face value, as visions of a Jewish exile who was carried away to Babylon in the reign of Nebuchadnezzar and who survived till the days of Cyrus, the Persian conqueror of Babylon. Newton could know nothing of the modern conclusion according to which the *Book of Daniel* belongs to the literary *genre* of *pseudepigrapha*,[4] of which a characteristic feature was to utter prophecies after the event and pass them off as predictions by putting them into the mouth of some saint or sage of the by-gone past. Modern criticism inclines to refer the date of composition of the *Book of Daniel* to the days of King Antiochus Epiphanes (about 168 B.C.), more than 350 years later than the date assigned to it in Newton's time. Hence the argument from the fulfilment of prophecy can hardly be accepted now in the form in which Newton stated it. It is still valid, but it needs to be restated. Perhaps one of the best popular attempts to assign to Biblical prophecy its proper place and significance is *Prophecy and Authority, a study in the history of the doctrine and interpretation of Scripture*, by Kemper Fullerton.[5] Dr. Fullerton's argument is too long to summarize here, but a brief quotation from his conclusion sums the matter up in a nutshell:

> 'Jesus fulfilled prophecy, not because he is the fulfiller of prophetic predictions, but because he is the fulfiller of prophetic ideals' (p. 197).

Turning from literary or higher criticism to textual or lower criticism, we cannot but admire the perspicacity of Newton's mind and the soundness of his judgment. His studies in textual criticism

[1] *Prophecies of Holy Writ*, Part I, cap. iii, § 1 *Collected Works*, ed. Horsley, Vol. V p. 312.

[2] *op. cit.*, p. 305. [3] *op. cit.*, § 16, p. 331.

[4] See the great collection of these writings, *Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament*, published by the Clarendon Press, 1913.

[5] Published by the Macmillan Company, New York, 1919.

are contained in *A Historical Account of Two Notable Corruptions of the Scriptures*, which he sent to his friend John Locke, the philosopher, in November 1690. The first with which he dealt was the famous passage known as the 'Three Heavenly Witnesses' in *I John* v, 7 (Authorised Version):

> 'For there are three that bear witness in heaven, the Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghost; and these three are one.'

The second corruption which he treated was the variant adopted in *I Timothy* iii, 16 (Authorised Version):

> 'God was manifest in the flesh.'

The documentary apparatus at Newton's disposal was much smaller than is now possessed by the textual critic, yet Newton's conclusions with regard to both these scriptural passages have been completely substantiated by subsequent scholarship. The Revised Version accordingly omits the Heavenly Witnesses passage in *I John* v, 7 altogether: and in *I Timothy* iii, 16, the Revised Version reads

> 'He who was manifested in the flesh.'

Newton made the Bible the basis of his theology and of his religion. He could not, of course, escape the dangers which beset those who build on this foundation alone. Taking the Bible as his criterion of faith and practice, he found the Church of the Fathers unsatisfactory on both counts, and allowed its decisions no authority over Christian faith and practice. He had no sympathetic understanding of the development of dogma. He could not conceive that the Holy Ghost who 'spake by the prophets' could speak infallibly through the Christian Church of later ages. Doctrinally Newton may rightly be described as a Bible Christian, though he has been most unjustly assailed as a 'clamorous infidel.' It must however be admitted that he was not an Athanasian or Conciliar Trinitarian. He derived his theology and Christology from the New Testament direct. He was in fact a simple Bible Christian, like the poor but good Christian woman described by William Cowper:

> 'Yon cottager, who weaves at her own door,
> Pillow and bobbins all her little store,
> Just knows, and knows no more, her Bible true
> And in that charter reads, with sparkling eyes,
> Her title to a treasure in the skies.'

Newton was unspoilt by fame and greatness. Though he highly valued his friendship with Locke, he was not a Deist, but had a lively belief in prayer. He kept faithful to the practice of religion, such as he had learned it at Grantham Grammar School and at the parsonages of North Witham and Burton Coggles, where he had been brought up. In this respect he may be compared to Louis

Pasteur, the greatest bacteriologist of the nineteenth century, who continued loyally throughout his life to practise the religion which he had imbibed in his childhood from his devout, uneducated mother.

Newton's views on the moral obligation of being kind to animals were in advance of his age. His transparent honesty was one of the qualities which led to his appointment as Master of the Mint. Every Englishman owes him a debt of gratitude for the ability with which he carried through the much-needed reform of the coinage. His humility is illustrated by his famous estimate of himself in his old age:

> 'I do not know what I may appear to the world; but to myself I seem to have been only like a boy playing on the sea shore, and diverting myself in now and then finding a smoother pebble or a prettier shell, whilst the great ocean of truth lay all undiscovered before me.'

Newton's estimate of himself is in striking contrast to that which inspired William Wordsworth to write of him, as he contemplated his statue in Trinity College, Cambridge,

> '. . . Newton, with his prism and silent face,
> The marble index of a mind for ever voyaging
> Through strange seas of thought alone,'
>
> (*Prelude III*, 61 *f.*)

The Latin inscription on Newton's monument in Westminster Abbey, which commemorates him as

> 'An Assiduous, Sagacious, and Faithful Interpreter of Nature, Antiquity, and the Holy Scriptures. He asserted in his Philosophy the Majesty of God, and exhibited in his Conduct the simplicity of the Gospel,' [6]

constitutes an admirable summary of his character both as a scientist and a Christian. We conclude with two incidents in his life which indicate that his religion was not restricted to theological speculation, Biblical study and private prayer, but expressed itself also in practical action.

When James II, whose attempts to Romanize the University of Oxford are well known, directed that the University of Cambridge should admit Alban Francis, a Benedictine monk, to the degree of M.A. without taking the oaths of allegiance and supremacy, Newton played a leading part in a deputation sent by the Senate of the University to London to interview that notorious personage, 'Judge Jeffreys,' in opposing the royal command.[7]

Nicolas Wickins records that he and his father had been the dispensers of many dozens of Bibles sent by Sir Isaac Newton for poor people, and he adds: 'I have now many by me sent from him for the same purpose.' [8]

[6] *Brewster's Life*, II, 395.
[7] *Isaac Newton: A Biography* by L. T. More, p. 338.
[8] *Brewster's Life*, II, 90.

THE MODERNITY OF THE BIBLE

By Professor S. A. Cook, Litt.D., F.B.A.

BY the Modernity of the Bible I mean its far-reaching topicality for the present day. It is of course unnecessary to enlarge upon the part the Bible has played in active Christendom: such a book as Prothero's *Psalms in Human Life* illustrates the manifold ways in which Christians have found comfort, encouragement and inspiration in the Psalter alone. But we are in an age when the deepest feelings are being painfully moved, and in the Bible as nowhere else we have some of the writings and utterances called forth by great crises in history such as we ourselves can perhaps appreciate more vividly than could our ancestors. The late George Adam Smith once spoke of Cromwell as 'the best commentator Isaiah has ever had,' and 'that,' he goes on to say, 'by an instinct born not only of the same faith, but of experience in tackling similar sorts of character.'[1] He himself did much, more perhaps than any other preacher-teacher, to 'modernise'; and he had to defend himself against the accusation that by applying a prophecy of Isaiah to a problem of the day he was 'prostituting prophecy.'[2] Indeed, it has been the recent perusal of some of G. A. Smith's writings that has suggested the present article; for this 'modernizing,' though it obviously runs the risk of abuse, can be pursued further. In and behind the Bible we find periods of extreme tension, and while we of to-day can often more intelligently understand and interpret past crises because of the fulness of present experiences, conversely we may intelligently use the past to throw light upon our age. Examples will occur to everyone: for example, as George Adam Smith pointed out, like Isaiah's Israel we have our own 'Assyria,' and can read in the book that bears his name what we can take unto ourselves, whether our 'Assyria' be an external enemy that is attacking our freedom, or internal social and other factors that are threatening our welfare.

The Bible when studied in the light of modern knowledge accustoms us to periods of sweeping changes, the rise and fall of empires and states, and the growth and decline of religion. The vast international changes round about the sixth century B.C. are profoundly impressive to the historian; but Israel herself plays little part: the stage is held by Egypt, Assyria and Babylonia, by Scythia, Media and Persia.[3] Yet the transition leading from pre-

[1] *Isaiah* i, 161 *ff.*

[2] *Minor Prophets* i, p. xi.

[3] See the second and third synchronistic tables at the end of the *Cambridge Ancient History*, vol. iii.

exilic Israel and her prophets to post-exilic Judaism and the dawn of Christianity, and ultimately to the growth of Christendom, stands out above all the 'secular' events. They claim our most earnest attention in this history-making age; for the world-wide 'secular' vicissitudes of to-day, tremendous enough in all conscience though they are, will in the long run be transcended by whatever progressive development of religion shall be the outcome.

This is surely a fact of the highest significance, and it is simple wisdom, therefore, to seek to understand, as carefully and completely as modern criticism allows, the changes that were made and which unite the pre-Israelite Near (or Middle) East with Israel and with Christendom. In so doing we should be concerned, not merely with that great field itself, but with the general development of thought which unites earlier and later ways of thinking and conditions our general attitudes and presuppositions. This development has not ceased. Accordingly we should not take too narrow a view of our day, however pressing and insistent its events; and we should bear in mind at the outset that the seemingly hopeless position of Israel and of Israel's religion when, as Zephaniah testifies, men could protest that God could do neither good nor evil — He simply didn't count — was subsequently followed by those little-known years when, thanks to her prophets and reformers, Israel 'rediscovered' her God and her mission.

In former years one spoke of 'false' religions, or of Mohammed as an 'impostor.' But religions and religious reformers whom we reject are not so easily disposed of. The popular dichotomy into the spheres of the 'religious' and the 'non-religious' is not so vital as the more delicate distinction between grades and degrees of religion or of religious development. Certainly the use of religious phraseology and ritual is in itself not necessarily an indication of pre-eminent spiritual worth (cf. *Mk.* vii, 6, citing *Is.* xxix, 13). Nor are second-sight, clairvoyance, divination and other psychic gifts religious or spiritual in themselves. And as for 'prophets,' we can learn from Josephus how some of those of his day could prove disastrous for the Jewish state. As Biblical students we are naturally interested in prophecy 'true' and 'false,' but we have perhaps paid too little heed to the problems which it must have presented. Then, as now, the prophets could be what Burkitt called 'social nuisances';[4] and although we may agree that the essential function of the 'true' prophets was to castigate the deadly defects of the current religion, the question of the distinction between them and their 'false' brethren raises perplexing questions.

The moral character of the prophet means much, as do both his claim to be the instrument of a Divine Power and the fulfilment of

[4] *The New Commentary* i, 430.

his utterances. But 'true' prophecy, it has been said, 'must agree with previously revealed truth.'[5] That is to say, there must be a definite continuity, older 'truth' being endorsed and reclothed in accord with newer conditions. As in evolution there will be the recurrence of pattern along with a progressive development; so to evolution in Nature corresponds progressive revelation in Man.[6] Our conception of the latter surely needs restatement, for in one sense it is not religion that evolves, but rather its forms and manifestations. Certain monotheistic trends can be recognized even among various primitive tribes, but it is psychological; it is an individual rather than a social phenomenon. Monotheism in the Second Isaiah has not the particular embodiment that it has in Zoroastrianism or in Islam, and it could not have been found in the Mosaic age. It is the quality and texture of a monotheism and all that gives it influence and permanence that count; and one may say, quite generally, that the steps in the progressive development of religion depend upon the conception of the triadic interrelation between gods, men and their world.

So as regards the Bible, the development lies, not so much in the 'history' we construct of Israel's Yahweh, as in the heightening of conceptions of this triangle in the course of the increasing complexity of life and thought. God is the God of Nature and of Man—as in the Bible—and our religion and our science of to-day will be gravely imperfect until they are brought into intelligible and rational association. Our analyses of the world and our differentiated and specialized knowledge render it difficult to grasp and restate for ourselves what at past epochs was intelligible and reasonable. Contrast the thought-world of Jesus and St. Paul with that of to-day, and we can see that what is now required is not the subordination of religion to science or the reverse, but a fresh synthesis, as it was when Yahweh was the God of Israel, and of other peoples, and of the Cosmos.[7]

For us who are students of biblical history I do not think that there is anything that should so stir our depths as the fact that as we traverse the centuries and pass from the Old Testament to the

[5] E. F. Siegman, *The False Prophets of the Old Testament*, p. 83; cf. *Journal of Theological Studies*, XL, 446.

[6] This recalls the old typology; see especially A. B. Davidson, *Old Testament Prophecy*, ch. xiii.

[7] Here I may note the pages devoted by the late Professor Creed (whose premature death was a grievous blow to Christian scholarship) to the doctrine of the 'Cosmic Christ' (*The Divinity of Jesus Christ*, 1938, pp. 129*ff*., 138*ff*.). On this subject see also Prof. Raven, *The Creator Spirit* (1927). In religion generally the gods (1) stand in a personal relationship to their people, and/or (2) are more or less departmentally operative in Nature (as understood by them) and in Man.

New we realize that there was some fatal flaw in the lofty spiritual and ethical idealism of Israel. Otherwise Christianity could not have risen, flourish and conquer as it did. We must whole-heartedly value the high qualities of post-exilic Judaism — even as we may those of any religion we do not accept — but a Day of Judgment had come, and the old Israel was found wanting. When Christian thought harks back to the New Testament we may forget that the Bible is, in a very real sense, the record of the election and rejection of a chosen people. Israel had felt herself to be chosen; she was the first-born of her God: but the prophets had the task of warning her that this relationship was not a natural or automatic one, or to be taken for granted. If we condemn the old Israel we condemn a virile and passionate people of twenty and more centuries ago, and we may forget that even the New Israel, the 'Israel of God,' might in its turn be weighed and found wanting. Such a notion might be as inconceivable to us as it was to those who once cried 'we have Abraham to our father' (*Luke* iii, 8), but whose zeal for God was 'not according to knowledge' (*Rom.* x, 2). We cannot take Christianity for granted; it depends upon Christians.

Those who feel or claim a unique relationship with the God of the Universe are not exempt from the penalty of their failings. We hark back to Amos, the preacher of Divine Righteousness — and a righteousness exceeding that of his age was also demanded by Jesus (*Matt.* v. 20). Yahweh's care was extended widely outside Israel (x, 7), and Amos laid down a cosmic, a divine principle true for all time, in his most famous utterance (iii, 2). We can state it in general terms: your conviction of a unique relationship between your God and yourself, your Church or your country makes a sterner claim upon your integrity and your loyal adhesion to all your God means for you. Once admit you have been highly gifted — and here one passes on to the Parable of the Talents — and it will be expected of you according to your gifts. And if the man who received one talent and hid it was condemned, what then shall be said of a people—and it applies to our own—were it to forget or wish to forget its past favours?

In days of distress or defeat it was as natural for Israel to speak of Yahweh's wrath as to assume that prosperity or even normal conditions betokened his love. Indeed, even to-day some believe that this war is a sign of God's anger! But Hosea was convinced of Yahweh's love for Samaria and of his grief for her doom; and *Deut.* viii, 5, generalises the conviction of his severe disciplinary love. And when we come to the last tragedy of Israel, while St. Paul manifests his heartfelt concern for his people (*Rom.* ix-xi), an unknown writer in *II Esdras* is assured that he himself could not love his unhappy brethren more than did their Creator (v. 33;

viii, 47).[8] We are apt, perhaps, to talk too freely of the Love of God, whereas we should recall Thomas Jefferson's words, 'I tremble for my country when I reflect that God is just,' and the sentiment of Young (*Night Thoughts*), 'a God all mercy is a God unjust.' Cultivating an imperishable belief in God's loving but disciplinary care for man, our experience is enhanced and our convictions of His nature powerfully enlarged. If there be a God, such-and-such *must* be his attributes. In the presence of man's inhuman cruelty and evil it may be easy for us to speak of His remoteness, or His helplessness, or to cherish a Dualism; but a great advance is made when we realize man's freedom to make or mar himself and his world. We cannot judge history by our short lives or by the current fortunes of our people and land. If there be indeed a God of Righteousness — and it is the conviction that runs throughout the Bible — there must be a natural recompense of good and evil, though it may fall outside our immediate view. Faith then demands — what it implies — the unity of the race in space and time and the unity of man and nature.

We are called upon to repent for our sins. Repentance in biblical language is 'return' to God and 'change of mind.' But we never return to actual earlier stages of experience and thought: the earlier is reasserted in a new form, so that a change of mind is involved — the two terms are thus interconnected. It is precisely the reappearance of the old in new forms that characterizes progressive development. Realizing afresh old and well-tested truths, we can embody them in a new structure and a higher mode of existence. To ask what 'sin' connotes takes us to fundamental conceptions of good and evil, of right and wrong. In Israel 'sin' was rebellion against a divine law, or being in the 'wrong' as against what was 'right.' More generally, to sin was to miss the mark, to fail, to fall short; and even in English the word 'sin' has been applied to a violation of some standard of taste or propriety, an offence against some principle or standard (*Oxford English Dictionary*). The general notion of sin was as far-reaching as that of 'righteousness,' for the latter is 'rightness,' the state of being all-right, and the consequences. There has been a development of the underlying ideas in the course of the increasing complexity of society, but sin is not to be recognized simply by a reference to the Decalogue. The New Testament marks a striking advance upon the Old in its analysis and condemnation of human frailty and wilfulness. There is a closer insight into human nature, due no doubt to the more complex conditions of the Hellenistic age, in contrast to the relatively undifferentiated usage in the Old Testament.

[8] Josephus starts his prayer with the words 'Since it pleases Thee who didst create the Jewish nation to break Thy work . . .' (iii, 8, 13).

Whereas illness, mishap or defeat could once be regarded as an indication that something was not 'right,' the tendency has been to confine 'sin' and 'right(eous)ness' to the religious and moral spheres. It is necessary, therefore, to observe that ideas of right and wrong had a much wider connotation. As it is, there is too much 'wrong' thinking and doing which we scarcely regard as 'sin'; and there is, therefore, the risk that the presence of shocking evils may tempt us to cloak over and obscure our own shortcomings which we like to regard as slight or venial. We so often 'miss the mark' because of the flabbiness of our norms and standards.[9]

On analysis we reach more abstract and neutral ideas of good and evil, the 'right' being what is in conformity with a recognized standard or norm, the 'wrong' being its absence. A thing is 'good' if it has the properties adapted to its purpose; an act has its immanent effectiveness and its inherent necessary consequences unless there are counteracting factors—whether it be skill in healing or in embezzling. As society becomes more complex the need grows for weighing the relative values of conflicting activities, *e.g.* the pain caused by a successful operation, the bandit's generosity to the poor. Our outlooks must then be guided and steadied by our faith in an underlying and ultimate Divine Righteousness, though in practice we may swing between the nearer and remoter ends, between concrete situations and abstract ideals.

Our faith is in the conquering power of an absolute and eternal Good that overrules our differentiated modes of existence. We can think of the head of a department who allows his subordinates to carry out their minor activities freely in their own way, provided they are in accord with the spirit of the undertaking. He gives his instruments their freedom, within limits; but he will intervene, directly or indirectly, as the occasion demands. Next we can see how, amid our ordinary work-a-day activities, a higher, wiser or better self often seems to emerge and to adjust, correct or reject what we had previously done in complete conscientiousness and in all integrity. So can we conceive that the Supreme Reality we call God can directly or indirectly operate in a world wherein we have acted now in harmony with His spirit and now in opposition to it. We may be engaged with the purest of motives upon works which we feel sure are in accord with the will of God—others would speak of accord with historical necessity, or the cosmic process, or the like—but the day may come when we have to realize that we are but the instruments of a Process, a Power that transcends us, and whose thoughts are not our thoughts.

We recall Jeremiah's protest, 'Thou didst deceive me and I

[9] In Babylonia and Egypt among the offences to be confessed are backbiting and mischief-making, lying, false weights, and oppression of the weak.

let myself be deceived' (xx); only by purging himself could the prophet continue to be God's instrument (xv, 19). God tests men; He is said to harden men's hearts: and if, on the one hand, there has been an accommodation to man's weakness or to a lower stage of development (*Ezek.* xx, 25; *Mk.* x, 5), on the other, there comes the time when we must forsake our old ways (cf. *Deut.* xii, 8). Again, there can be a hardening of sensibility; men have made their ideals their idols: God then, as Browning said, is merely 'a tame confederate,' and as the Latin tag puts it, *sua cuique Deus fit dira cupido.* It can be seen only too clearly to-day how a tremendously powerful energy can urge on men who are subjectively self-assured and confident in themselves along paths which we know to be iniquitous, destructive and suicidal. The Bible is the Book of the Prophet's Path, and there is need of a decisive reinterpretation of it as a whole, in order to further the growth of conscience and conscientiousness, and to synthesize religion and science, and the demands of both the heart and the head. The true prophet and leader is a thorough-going realist unifying concrete activities and the things of the Spirit. It is not wholly surprising, therefore, to find G. A. Smith asserting that 'Isaiah, in the largest sense of the expression, is a man of the world'; and he adds, 'a man of the world because God made the world and rules it.'[10] If, as I understand, more heed is paid nowadays to the conception of Incarnation than to that of Atonement, it is a welcome sign of the times, in that only as we gain a new and more vivid recognition of the Spiritual Reality in and behind the world do we become more conscious of the need of a redemption, an at-one-ment, a 'right-(eous)ness' exceeding that of the present.

To 'modernise' the Bible is to restate its teaching of God's care for His world, the cattle (cf. *Jonah* iv, 11), the flowers of the field, the birds of the air, and all the little things of life. It is to reiterate the value and responsibility of the individual, the member of the 'true' Israel of God. And here I am tempted to make one last reference to George Adam Smith. Not only was he at pains to insist that the great prophets were not politicians but statesmen, and that the offices of the prophet and of the demagogue were absolutely irreconcilable He makes the pungent remark, which all exponents of Democracy should take to heart, that a people are responsible for their country's politics:

> 'What the people are, that will their politics be; if you wish to reform the politics you must first regenerate the people.'[11]

To bring about a reformation of social, political and international conditions one has first to strike at the individuals—even the least

[10] *Isaiah,* vol. i, p. 300. [11] *Isaiah,* vol. i, p. 224*f.*; cf. p. 119.

—who constitute the community. Flabby thinking about the things that really matter is a 'sin,' and we have to realize that ideas make and mar our world.[12] We have only to recognize the great progressive changes that were due to the prophets of the Old Testament and the New — for Jesus too was a prophet — to perceive that the first step out of this present welter, and the only one of permanent effect, is to seek first the Kingdom of God (*Luke* xii, 31).

In the Bible we trace some of the great events that changed the world; to-day we are in the very midst of the transition. A historical view of the Bible brings out its modern appeal, its modernity, in a way that turning over its leaves for appropriate texts fails to do. Our Modernism has its task; it is to 'modernise' the Bible, and to insist upon what the title of this little sketch—for it is nothing more—calls 'the Modernity of the Bible.'

ANTICHRIST AND THE SCARLET WOMAN

By the Rev. GAMALIEL MILNER, M.A., author of *The Problem of Decadence*, etc.

LONG ago, in the happy days of the last war, we were in the company of a charming retired officer, a genial Evangelical of the old school, of a type now unfortunately extinct. In discussing our leading politicians we happened to remark that one of them, say, Mr. Lloyd George, was a clever man. 'Yes,' he assented, 'but Antichrist will be a cleverer.' Evidently to him Antichrist was just as much an historical character as Asquith or Lloyd George.

It was a little surprising at first, but we reflected that the gallant officer's standpoint was that of nearly all Christians in ancient and mediaeval times. 'Ye have heard that Antichrist shall come,' says the writer of the *First Epistle of St. John*. St. Paul's visit to Thessalonica was a brief one, but in the few months he was there he found time to instruct his converts about the coming of the Son of Perdition. 'You cannot have forgotten that while I was still with you, I was in the habit of telling you these things' (II *Thess.* ii. 5. Milligan).

But the chief authority for Antichrist, though, as we shall see, the word does not occur in it, is the *Apocalypse*, attributed on rather strong external evidence to the Beloved Disciple, the

[12] *e.g.* John Stuart Mill in his *Autobiography* (popular ed., p. 137) writes: 'I am now convinced that no great improvements in the lot of mankind are possible until a great change takes place in the fundamental constitution of their mode of thought.' Other quotations could be made.

Apostle St. John. If this terrific piece of invective is really to be ascribed to the bosom friend of our Lord, it would seem that the latter can hardly have been the gentle Jesus of nineteenth century Christology. Conscientious objectors sometimes ask if we can imagine Jesus Christ throwing bombs. Apparently his bosom friend could: 'And great hail, every stone about the weight of a talent, cometh down from heaven upon men.'

It is usual to talk about the mysterious *Book of the Revelation*. Probably most contemporary Christians regretted that it was not a little more mysterious. What astonishes one is that anyone should have dared to circulate what was obviously from the point of view of the Roman government a seditious publication. It was only too obvious that the city that reigneth over the kings of the earth (*Rev.* xvii, 18), Babylon 'the Mother of Harlots,' could only mean Rome.

Much of the supposed mystery of the *Book of the Revelation* arises from the fact that it is an apocalypse, a conventional form of literature which had a great vogue at the time when it was written. Apocalypses seem to have been the favourite reading of serious Jews in the first century of our era; they were what detective novels are to-day; to like working them out was no more a sign of idiocy than a taste for cross-word puzzles is in the twentieth century. The triumph of St. John, or whoever wrote the work commonly ascribed to him, lay in the fact that he contrived to make out of this bizarre kind of composition a work of genius which has impressed even so very unmystical a reader as M. Hippolyte Taine in nineteenth century France.

Beginning with the clue with which the author has obligingly furnished us we have no difficulty in equating Babylon with Rome. The Beast on which she sits is clearly the Imperial system, what we call the Roman Empire, to be identified with the Fourth Beast of Daniel, as interpreted in *Second Esdras* and elsewhere. The Beast, according to the convention of apocalyptic zoology, has ten horns, ten kings it is interpreted, having on each of them the name of Blasphemy, the title *Sebastos*, the Greek equivalent of Augustus, the Worshipful, a direct challenge, so it seemed, to Jews and Christians, to Him Who alone is holy and worthy of worship. As the harlot Babylon typifies the meretricious charm of an alien civilization, so the monster bodies forth the inhuman strength of a soulless despotism. It is hardly necessary to say that St. John sees Graeco-Roman civilization through a distorted medium; its higher aspects are utterly ignored.

There is one Roman ruler, the worst and last, in whom all the monstrous tendencies of the Satanic world empire of evil are, so to speak, incarnated. Mindful of the risks in which he was in-

volving not only himself but his fellow-Christians, the Apocalyptist is a little vague; the picture was probably originally intended to suit Nero, and may have been altered to suit Domitian, 'Nero the bald,' Juvenal calls him. Anyway, the Antichrist of the *Apocalypse* is a heathen persecutor, a Roman emperor.

There is one passage in St. Paul's Epistles which stands in close relation to St. John's *Apocalypse*, the picture of the Man of Sin in the second chapter of the *Second Epistle to the Thessalonians*, a passage so unlike anything else in his writings that the authenticity or integrity of the Epistle has been doubted. There is, however, one curious feature of the picture of 'the Son of Perdition' which is at variance with the main outline of St. John, that the manifestation of the lawless one is to take place in the Temple of God (apparently at Jerusalem).

When we turn to the *Epistles of St. John*, where alone in the New Testament we meet with the word 'Antichrist,' we are confronted at once with an entirely different figure. As the Monster of the *Apocalypse* is clearly a heathen persecutor, the Antichrist is obviously a heresiarch, a Christian presbyter gone wrong. The simplest explanation of the discrepancy would be to say that the Antichrist of the Epistles and the Monster of the *Apocalypse* are two entirely different persons (or things). Nevertheless the solemn introduction, 'Ye have heard that Antichrist shall come,' seems to point to the arch-enemy of God, the stock figure of Jewish eschatology. The writer of the Epistles, who, it is generally agreed, was also the writer of the Fourth Gospel, expected an Antichrist who is a false teacher, not a heathen persecutor. This is one of the many indications which make it difficult to believe in the identity of the Evangelist with him who saw the *Apocalypse*. We see from Justin Martyr that in very early times an attempt was made to bring the incongruous figures, the Monster and the False Teacher, into contact with each other. A preposterous legend arose that Simon Magus, the typical heretic, had gone to Rome and become a sort of Court Chaplain to Nero.

The *Apocalypse*, it is quite clear, enjoyed a great popularity with Christians in the days of persecution; it appealed to what we should now call Bolshevist tendencies and to the growing dislike felt in the East for Western civilization.

But the very qualities which endeared the book to fanatics made it repugnant to the respectable ecclesiastics, the bishops, who, especially in Roman Asia, were claiming to be the successors of the Apostles and shouldering out the rival order of Prophets. They were anxious for a *rapprochement* with the Roman Government and the cultivated classes generally. To lighten the ship they only wanted an excuse to fling overboard the *Apocalypse* with

its crude millenarianism and anti-Roman propaganda. Fortunately a Higher Critic, the learned Dionysius of Alexandria, pointed out the extraordinary difference in style between the Revelation and the Gospel of St. John. Since everybody by that time admitted that the Apostle wrote the Gospel, he could not, so it was argued, have written the *Apocalypse*. It might have been argued with at least equal force that the *Apocalypse* was his and not the Gospel; the former was much better attested; but Higher Critics, ancient and modern, are liable to be influenced by their prejudices. In the Greek East, especially after the conversion of Constantine, the upper clergy (like Eusebius, the Church Historian) ignored the *Apocalypse* or treated it as a work of doubtful authenticity; schismatics and the Oriental 'underworld' valued it all the more.

In the Latin West things took rather a different turn, it is a little difficult to say exactly why. Tertullian, a distinguished member of the Carthaginian Bar, became a Christian without ceasing to be a lawyer. In an apology addressed to the Roman Emperor he pleaded for toleration for his co-religionists. Arguing from a phrase in St. Paul's *Second Epistle to the Thessalonians*, he assured the Emperor that Antichrist was not Rome but some power that was to take Rome's place. (In his exegesis Tertullian is supported by many modern commentators.) All Christians therefore devoutly prayed for the prosperity of the Empire which was keeping Antichrist waiting.

When the Roman Empire fell, the world ought to have come to an end. The Middle Ages would not admit that it had fallen; the biggest 'fake' in history, the Holy Roman Empire with a German Caesar, kept up the illusion. But there was another heir to the lapsed inheritance, the successor of St. Peter, who was also by a strange turn of the wheel the *Pontifex Maximus*, the successor of *Divus Caesar*. It was not long before it began to be whispered in opposition and heretical circles that a Pope might be the Antichrist. Curiously enough the first person to suggest that a Christian priest and not a heathen monarch might be Antichrist was Gregory the Great. In his protest against the claims of the Patriarch of Constantinople (John the Faster) he said that whoever arrogates to himself the title of universal Bishop is a precursor of Antichrist.

During the Middle Ages the identification of Rome with the mystic Babylon became a commonplace with the heretics. Partisans of the Emperors in their quarrels with the Popes used the same missile. Even good Roman Catholics like Dante, who fully acknowledged the Pope to be the Vicar of Christ, thought it not impossible that, as the Devil is the ape of God, the Man of Sin

might be a pseudo-papa. Wycliffe, while still parish priest of Lutterworth, wrote a treatise, *De Christo et Suo Adversario Antichristo*, in which he identified the Pope as such with Antichrist.

The Protestant Reformers had no hesitation in seizing on a weapon which lay ready to their hand. Luther in his treatise *De Blasphemia* says that the Pope is the principal Vicar of Satan and Antichrist. In the Preface to the Authorized Version of the Bible the translators, in complimenting the Most High and Mighty King James on his polemical works, assure him and their readers that by his writings in defence of the truth he 'hath given such a blow unto that man of sin as will not be healed.' In 1606 both Houses of Convocation decreed that 'If any man shall affirm that the intolerable pride of the Bishop of Rome for the time being . . . doth not plainly argue him to be the Man of Sin, he doth greatly err.'

When the time came for the Church of Rome to make its great and largely successful counter-attack, its storm troopers, the Jesuits, the greatest reactionaries, they have been called, in history, could not avoid meeting the abominable charge which defamed the spotless Bride of Christ with the worst imputations. The sting of the accusation lay in the fact that Babylon in the New Testament did mean Rome; it was an article of faith that Babylon meant Rome in I *Peter* v, 13. But Rome at what period of her history? Not assuredly Christian Rome but Pagan Rome was in the mind of the Apostle. They had, in fact, though not entirely from disinterested motives, hit on the true interpretation, the view generally held by the primitive Church; it would be churlish to deny that the Society of Jesus rendered a valuable service to Scriptural exegesis. There was, however, one serious objection to their view in the eyes of orthodox believers. The Christians under the rule of the Roman Empire had taken it for granted that its fall would coincide with the Second Advent. Allegorize it as you might, that seemed the clear teaching of Revelation and of St. Paul. But on the Jesuits' hypothesis the whole fulfilment of the Book of Revelation lay in the past. Judged from this point of view it might well seem novel and dangerous, nevertheless it tended to become the prevailing view among Roman Catholics, though it has never been officially adopted by the Church. Before long it began to find favour with candid and moderate Protestants; Grotius gave it his support and Anglican divines like the learned Dr. Hammond. Gradually it went out of fashion to talk about the Papacy as the Whore of Babylon; after the rise of the Oxford Movement it was regarded as definitely ungentlemanly.

The primitive view, revived by the Jesuits, that the Beast was the Roman Empire commended itself to the Rationalists of the eighteenth century for two reasons: the first was its intrinsic pro-

bability, the second its value for anti-orthodox polemics. Clearly St. John was wrong in thinking the fall of Rome imminent and that it would coincide with the end of the world. St. John, in fact, was a mistaken visionary whose wish was father to his thought.

Of late years the anticipation of a future personal Antichrist, a non-Christian persecutor, has tended to revive. Movements have their inevitable reactions; extremes tend to generate their opposites. Beneath the tide of Modernism on the surface was a deep current of what is sometimes called fundamentalism. Apocalypticism represents a perennial mood of the human mind; it will never disappear as long as there is evil in the world. From the time of the French Revolution the possibility of a definitely anti-Christian movement seizing power could never be wholly banished from men's minds. There were those who fancied that Napoleon might be Antichrist: his unusual Christian name suggested Apollyon, the Angel of the Bottomless Pit. To-day, amid the wreck of systems and of creeds, the Dictator, as in ancient Rome, becomes the demi-god. To Christians he is the false Messiah. As we see the spread of Hitler's legions through once peaceful and flourishing lands, we see a beast, dreadful and terrible and strong exceedingly:

> 'and it had great iron teeth; it devoured and brake in pieces, and stamped the residue with its feet; and it was diverse from all the beasts that were were before it.'

The *Apocalypse of St. John* is the expression, the greatest in literature, of what we may call the revolutionary temper. It is a mood which is inherent in all great and worthy natures, the hatred of what the Baptismal Service calls the Pomps and Vanities of this wicked world. It is the fire which burns up shams, the voice within us which bids defiance to the worship of brute force and stolid contentment with things as they are. But it is a destructive force which destroys things good as well as evil. One may fancy that in His Parable of the Tares our Lord had in mind the two Sons of Thunder who wished Him to call down fire on the Samaritan villagers. The Revolutionary can see no good in what he attacks. The Protestants of the sixteenth century forgot that the Roman Church, even under Borgia, was on the whole a force that made for good. The same thing was true of the Roman Empire, even under Nero; St. Paul admitted as much in his Epistles. The Bible would not be complete without the sublime outburst of the *Apocalypse*; but it is, perhaps, to be regretted that it stands at the end, for it is not the last word about God and His purposes for mankind.

JAN CHRISTIAAN SMUTS

By The Rev. T. Hyslop, M.A., Worcester College, Oxford.

THE son of a hard-working and serious-minded South African Dutch farmer—a member of the old Cape Legislative Assembly—Jan Christiaan Smuts first saw the light of day in 1870. The place of his birth was a lone farm near the hamlet of Riebeek West and forty miles from Cape Town. After attending a boarding school at Riebeek West, and showing himself to be intellectually brilliant at Victoria College, Stellenbosch, he came to England and entered Christ's College, Cambridge. There he obtained a First in both parts of the Law Tripos. In 1894 he was admitted to the Middle Temple and, returning to Africa in the following year, he was called to the Bar in Cape Town: he also became a member of the staff of the *Cape Times*.

In those days a violent and bitter controversy was in progress between Cecil Rhodes and Paul Kruger. Rhodes, the Prime Minister of Cape Colony, wanted a united South Africa. He wanted to see the Transvaal, the Orange Free State, Cape Colony and Natal welded together into an indissoluble unity, and, although remaining an entirely self-governing nation, yet part of the British Empire. He wanted Dutch and English to learn the art of living together without strife. Kruger, who was President of the Transvaal and ruled his people like some Old Testament patriarch, also wanted a united South Africa, but one which should be Dutch and independent. The ruling passion of his life was to have the British expelled.

Smuts, fresh from England, supported Rhodes with an ardour which perhaps only the young can know. The support lasted but for a few months, however, for so shocked was he by the unsuccessful Jameson Raid into the Transvaal, which was arranged by Rhodes to throw out the government there, that he immediately transferred his allegiance to Kruger. Thus when the Boer War eventually broke out between Great Britain and the two Dutch Republics of the Transvaal and the Orange Free State, Smuts was one of our most resolute and prominent enemies. In 1896 he joined the Transvaal Bar, settled in Johannesburg, and proceeded to write and to speak against Rhodes and the British. Two years later he was made, in spite of his youth (and inexperience), State Attorney of the Transvaal Republic. In 1899 he was present at the Bloemfontein Conference between Sir Alfred Milner, High Commissioner of the Cape, and Kruger, the object of which was

to try and avert war, and as soon as he realized that the Conference had been a failure and that war was a certainty, he produced his violently anti-British pamphlet, *A Century of Wrong*. During the war he distinguished himself as a fearless, determined and elusive leader of a guerilla band in Cape Colony. Note that in his saddle bag he carried a copy of Kant's *Critique of Pure Reason*.

The war at last ended with Great Britain victorious, and the two republics lost their independence. Smuts was of course no longer the State Attorney of the Transvaal, and he began private practice at the bar in Pretoria. Realizing that Kruger's cause was now hopeless, he espoused his original political ideal and once more made Rhodes' vision for South Africa his own. In 1904 Botha, another Boer who had distinguished himself as a soldier in the war, formed his *Het Volk Party*, the programme of which was immediate self-government for the Transvaal. Smuts eagerly joined the party, and in 1905 he travelled to England to acquaint the new Liberal government with *Het Volk Party's* demands. His mission was a success, and self-government was granted to the Transvaal in 1906. Botha was the first Prime Minister, and Smuts the first Colonial Secretary and Minister of Education. The Orange Free State was granted self-government in the following year.

Still under the spell of Rhodes, Smuts was very far from content with things as they were. He realized how foolish it was to have four governments in an area which ought to be politically united. He did everything in his power to convince others of the soundness of his political ideal, and he was an influential personality at the National Convention held at Durban in 1908 to discuss the possibility of union between the four governments. When the Act of Union was passed in 1909, he said of the new constitution, 'It bears the impress of a higher hand.' Botha and Smuts, leaders of the Transvaal, now became the leaders of the Union of South Africa. Botha became Prime Minister, and Smuts was made Minister of the Interior, Mines and Defence. In 1912 Smuts became Minister of Finance.

The first difficulty which this government of all South Africa had to face was Hertzog, the Minister of Justice, who was from the Free State. Hertzog's political ideals, then and thereafter, were those of Kruger, and he eventually left the Cabinet in order to form, in opposition to the South African Party of Botha and Smuts, his own Nationalist Party. Other difficulties followed. In 1913 the miners went on strike on the Rand, and, at great personal risk, Botha and Smuts went to Johannesburg and negotiated between

the strikers, who were in no peaceful temper, and the mine owners. At the beginning of 1914 there was another strike, and this Smuts ruthlessly put down. As soon as Great Britain declared war on Germany, a serious rebellion of Dutch nationalists broke out in the West Transvaal. This too was put down. In the following year there was a general election, and during the campaign preceding it an unsuccessful attempt was made to assassinate Smuts at a meeting at Newlands. Botha and Smuts were returned to power, but it was obvious to them that a large number of Dutchmen were supporting Hertzog.

During the Great War, Smuts assisted Botha in 1915 in the latter's victorious expedition in German South-West Africa, and in the next year he himself led the campaign in German East Africa. In 1917 Lloyd George formed the Imperial War Cabinet, and invited him to become a member. He consented, and it was in this capacity that during those dark, anxious days he chiefly distinguished himself. The British people were very impressed at having in London one who had been so formidable an enemy, and they were yet more impressed when they observed his great power of statesmanship. Many and various were the services which he performed with skill. He toured the country speaking. He went to the Western Front to see how matters stood. He travelled to the Middle East to confer with Allenby.

The war over, he resigned from the Cabinet, and in 1919 he was with Botha in Paris for the Peace Conference. He made himself extremely unpopular there by strenuously pleading for 'a spirit of pity, mercy, and forgiveness,' and, although he did not refuse to sign the Versailles Treaty, he published a protest against what he thought to be its defects and limitations.

> 'I have signed the Peace Treaty, not because I consider it a satisfactory document, but because it is imperatively necessary to close the war; because the world needs peace above all, and nothing could be more fatal than the continuance of the state of suspense between war and peace. The months since the armistice was signed have perhaps been as upsetting, unsettling and ruinous to Europe as the previous four years of war. I look upon the Peace Treaty as the close of those two chapters of war and armistice, and only on that ground do I agree to it.
>
> I say this now, not in criticism, but in faith; not because I wish to find fault with the work done, but rather because I feel that in the Treaty we have not yet achieved the real peace to which our peoples were looking, and because I feel that the real work of making peace will only begin after this Treaty has been signed, and a definite halt has thereby been called to the destructive passions that have been desolating Europe for nearly five years. This Treaty is simply the liquidation of the war situation in the world. The promise of the new life, the victory of the great human ideals for which the peoples have shed their blood and their treasure without stint, the fulfilment of their aspirations towards a new

international order and a fairer, better world are not written in this Treaty, and will not be written in treaties. "Not in this mountain, nor in Jerusalem, but in spirit and in truth," as the Great Master said, must the foundations of the new order be laid.

. . . . . .

'And this new spirit among the peoples will be the solvent for the problems which the statesmen have found too hard at the Conference. There are territorial settlements which will need revision. There are guarantees laid down which we all hope will soon be found out of harmony with the new peaceful temper and unarmed state of our former enemies. There are punishments foreshadowed, over most of which a calmer mood may yet prefer to pass the sponge of oblivion. There are indemnities stipulated which cannot be exacted without grave injury to the industrial revival of Europe, and which it will be in the interests of all to render more tolerable and moderate. There are numerous pin-pricks, which will cease to pain under the healing influences of the new international atmosphere. The real peace of the peoples ought to follow, complete, and amend the peace of the statesmen.

. . . . . .

'All this is possible, and I hope capable, of accomplishment; but only on two conditions. In the first place, the Germans must convince our peoples of their good faith, of their complete sincerity through a real honest effort to fulfil their obligations under the Treaty to the extent of their ability. They will find the British people disposed to meet them halfway in their unexampled difficulties and perplexities. But any resort to subterfuges or to underhand means to defeat or evade the Peace Treaty will only revive old suspicions and arouse anger and prove fatal to a good understanding. And, in the second place, our Allied peoples must remember that God gave them overwhelming victory — victory far beyond their greatest dreams—not for small selfish ends, not for financial or economic advantages, but for the attainment of the great human ideals for which our heroes gave their lives, and which are the real victors in this war of ideals.'

He left Paris an ardent champion of the League of Nations.

He returned to South Africa in the same year, and almost immediately after his arrival he became Prime Minister on Botha's death. He found his countrymen depressed by the war and hostile to him. He managed to remain in office for about five years, during which period the chief events were his attendance at two Imperial Conferences in England, and his successful quelling of the Johannesburg communist revolt.

The hostility of the Nationalists towards him grew even more violent until in 1924 he suddenly dissolved parliament. At the ensuing general election the Nationalists came into power, with Hertzog as Prime Minister. For the next nine years Smuts was the leader of the opposition. In 1925 he produced his celebrated philosophical treatise, *Holism and Evolution*. In 1929 he was the Rhodes Lecturer at Oxford, in 1930 he was lecturing and touring in America and Canada, and in 1931 he was again in England, this time presiding at the Centenary Meeting of the British Association.

By now the economic depression was hitting South Africa hard, and the activities of the Nationalist government were causing racial hatred between English and Dutch. A crisis seemed imminent and, in order to avert it, Smuts agreed to form a coalition with Hertzog. At the general election of 1933 the coalition won nearly every seat. Hertzog remained Prime Minister, and Smuts became his Deputy and also Minister of Justice. In 1934 the new government had the Status Act passed, which secured for South Africa the sovereign powers that had been offered to all the Dominions by the Statute of Westminster of 1931.

The coalition continued until the outbreak of the present war. In September, 1939, Hertzog, with his Kruger views, left the Cabinet in company with some of his colleagues. Smuts then became Prime Minister once more, and formed a new British and Dutch government. Since then he has been vigorously leading his people in the British Commonwealth of Nations to victory.

In his personal habits Jan Smuts is a puritan. He neither drinks, nor smokes, nor plays cards. Such things as dancing, racing, theatres and games he utterly abhors. He cares little for what he eats; he likes to make his own bed. At heart he is a simple Dutch farmer. He is a lover of nature, but has less appreciation of painting, music, sculpture, and architecture.

He is a difficult man to handle, for he does not suffer fools gladly. 'I have neither tact nor patience,' he said at the first cabinet meeting which he attended as Prime Minister, 'and you must take me for what I am worth.' Dictatorial, he gets furious at opposition. His enemies have called him the Oriental Despot, and have remarked that South Africa is a democracy, with apologies to Jan smuts.

Yet viewed more profoundly, he is seen to be an original philosopher, a great Christian, and a democrat. His philosophy, Holism, is for him not merely philisophical theory, but a spiritual religion. Although he long ago departed from the Calvinistic orthodoxy of the Dutch Reformed Church, the Church of his baptism, he has always been strongly influenced by its moral code. Like so many contemporary thinkers, he has rejected the belief in a personal God, and assumes instead the existence of an impersonal purpose, a power not ourselves which makes for righteousness. He believes that in the creative process there is a design, but no Designer. The term Holism is derived from a Greek word meaning the whole. Holism, he tells us, is a primary law of the universe

> 'according to which Evolution is an ascending series of wholes, of which man is the highest.'

Thus, at the beginning of the evolutionary process, you have the atoms. Then the atoms coalesce with other atoms to produce better wholes, and these wholes coalesce in turn to produce yet better wholes.

> 'The groaning and travailing of the universe is never,'

he assures us,

> 'aimless or resultless. Its profound labours mean new creation, the slow, painful birth of wholes, and the slow but steady realization of the good which all the wholes of the universe . . . dimly yearn and strive for.'

We are further told that the process of Holism applies beyond the range of physics and biology to human associations. For example, the Transvaal, the Free State, Cape Colony and Natal coalesced to form the Union of South Africa; the Union coalesced with the other dominions and the colonies to form the British Empire; and the Empire coalesced with various foreign countries to form the League of Nations.

Those who may find *Holism and Evolution* beyond them will perhaps be relieved to learn that a far simpler work by Smuts has just been produced.* It is a selection from the speeches which he has made since 1917. In this book the spirit of the man is clearly revealed, and I conclude this article with one or two quotations from it. First of all, this is what he says about Christianity, or rather about what he considers to be the only essential part of it, namely, its ethics.

> 'If you ask me what is wrong with Europe . . . I should say the moral basis in Europe, the bedrock of the Christian moral code, has become undermined and can no longer support all that super-structure of economic and industrial prosperity which the last century has built upon it, and the vast whole is now sagging.'

The New Order, which we hope to see after this present war,

> 'can only rise under the sign of the Cross, in the spirit of service and self-sacrifice, which has carried man from his brutal, bestial past to the height of his spiritual vision. Not in mastery, but in service, not in dictatorship, but in freedom lies the secret of man's destiny.'

Thus

> 'we now go forth [to the present day] as crusaders, as children of the Cross to fight for freedom.'

Smuts maintains that the world is good, and that life in it ought therefore to be a joyful thing.

> 'We must fill our daily lives with the spirit of joy and delight. We must carry this spirit into our daily lives and tasks. We must perform our work not grudgingly and as a burden imposed on us, but in a spirit of cheerfulness, goodwill and delight in it.'

**Plans for a Better World: Speeches of Field-Marshal the Right Honorable J. C. Smuts, P.C., C.H., K.C., D.T.D.* Hodder and Stoughton, 1942.

In another passage he tells us that virtue is its own reward.

And this about the democratic ideal:

> 'For me the individual is basic to any world order that is worth while. Individual freedom, individual independence of mind, individual participation in the difficult work of government seems to me essential to all true progress.' 'Perhaps I do not exaggerate when I say that of what we call liberty in its full meaning — freedom of thought, speech, action, self-expression — there is to-day less in Europe than there has been during the last 2,000 years.' 'If this [Nazi] war means anything at all it means surely this: that civilization is determined to uphold, and will uphold, the principle that racial domination, racial exclusiveness and top-dogism are in conflict with the whole trend of human progress and enlightenment.'

TWO OPPOSED CONCEPTIONS OF FAITH

By the Rev. N. E. Egerton Swann, M.A.,
Rector of St. Margaret Pattens with St. Gabriel's, London.

CONFESSEDLY faith is the basic virtue of the Christian Life, but as to what, in its inmost character, faith truly is, there is an enormous cleavage of opinion.

Let us look first at the definitions given by the extreme ecclesiastical Right. The conception of faith is put in all its naked crudity by a writer in the *Catholic Encyclopaedia*:

> 'Faith is supernatural assent to Divine truths upon Divine authority.'

How 'Divine authority' is to be understood the writer makes perfectly plain by quoting with approval Thomas Aquinas:

> 'The formal object of faith . . . is the First Truth as manifested in Holy Scripture and the Church's teaching. Hence if anyone does not adhere, as to an infallible and Divine rule, to the Church's teaching, which proceeds from the Church's truth manifest in Holy Scripture, such an one has not the habit of faith, but holds the truth of faith, not by faith, but by some other principle.'

The more extreme and rigid Anglo-Catholics go all the way with Rome on this issue. An Anglican writer of this school says, in words partly quoted from a Roman Catholic source,

> 'Faith is an act of intellect assenting to the truth of a proposition, not because it is evident to reason, but because its truth is vouched for by someone who knows and whom we can trust. An act of divine faith is an act by which one believes, whatever God has revealed, on God's authority. It is therefore obvious that we cannot make an act of divine faith before we have become convinced by reason that God exists and that He has spoken.'

This may sound plausible at the first moment of hearing, but we must needs ask instantly how, except by a prior act of Divine

faith, can we possibly know that God has revealed any proposed object of belief? This extreme 'Catholic' school talks glibly of 'Divine authority' and 'what God has revealed,' but when we get down to hard realities, we find that the authority we are actually being asked to accept is a human and earthly one, claiming to be the visible and tangible embodiment of Divine authority, and assumed, without any serious argument, to be completely identical in all its utterances with the very authority of God Himself.

Right over against that whole view there stands a radically different conception of faith — that faith is not a matter of assenting intellectually to dogmas on external authority at all, but of personal trust in a Divine Being. Fundamentally it is trust in God, but when it is specifically Christian faith, it is trust in Him more particularly as He has made Himself known, and has acted on our behalf, in and through our Lord Jesus Christ. It would not be difficult to show that this is the prevailing meaning of 'faith' in the New Testament taken as a whole, and very particularly in the language of the Synoptic Jesus and in St. Paul's Epistles. That this is so is by far the most important consideration, but it is a matter too of special interest to us as members of the Church of England that there is very strong reason to regard this as the typically and characterstically *Anglican* conception.

To begin with our authoritative formularies: the key reference to faith is to be found in Article XI, 'Of the Justification of Man.' Here, the whole context in which the word 'faith' stands, and the entire tone of the Article, make it clear that faith is used in an essentially Pauline sense. This contention is confirmed by the witness of a number of thoroughly representative English divines. Jeremy Taylor, who may fairly be described as the quintessential Anglican—almost more so than even Hooker himself—in his great work advocating religious toleration, *The Liberty of Prophesying*, reduces the essentials of Christianity to one article, 'Jesus Christ the Redeemer.' At that time all Christians took simply for granted the propositional conception of Revelation—the idea of it, that is, as consisting in a body of divinely guaranteed statements, to be found in the Bible. This somewhat hampered our English Chrysostom in his manner of expressing himself. He was forced to present this essential point in the form of an actual *article of belief* —as a statement of truth to be accepted and held by the mind. Yet the entire context makes it clear that he had, in actual fact, cut completely loose from the whole idea of faith as being intellectual assent to any dogma, and resolved it purely into personal trust in the Redeemer.

To come down to theologians of our own day. The late Professor Goudge of Oxford belonged definitely to the Anglo-Catholic

wing of the Church of England, but was one of those Anglo-Catholics who succeed in remaining unimpeachably Anglican in their outlook and mode of thought. He thus delivered himself on the merits of the extreme traditionalist Catholic view of faith :

> 'The mere acceptance of propositions from the mouth of authority is not Christian faith, but a most unhealthy substitute for it. . . . It can hardly be said too strongly that docility and obedience are not virtues, unless they are shown to the right authority. The great objection to false authority is not that it interferes with the rights of man, but that it interferes with the claims of conscience and of God.'

Bishop Gore, a somewhat more pronounced Anglo-Catholic, but likewise magnificently loyal to the fundamental mind of the Church of England, said much the same in a passage in his *Roman Catholic Claims*, in which he drew a sharp contrast between the Roman Catholic and the Anglican conceptions of faith.

> 'Faith,' he says, 'is an inner sense which faithfully and perseveringly apprehends God in spite of difficulties and through the veil.'

Strong pronouncements in the same sense have repeatedly been made by Dr. Headlam, perhaps the most distinguished theologian on the present Bench of Bishops, and the leading representative to-day of the time-honoured school of historic High Anglicanism (as distinct from modern Anglo-Catholicism), and, as such, standing in the succession of Hooker, Jeremy Taylor, Archbishop Wake, Dean Hook and Archbishop Benson. Notable sayings of Dr. Headlam are :

> 'Nor again is it really possible to accept the creeds as documents which are inerrant or final. . . . Nor again do we feel that in such a matter as this formulation of truth, or its explanation, anything that the Church does should be unalterable. . . . The Spirit is working through the modern mind and we must listen to His voice.'

Finally, this criticism of the Roman and Anglo-Catholic definition of faith has been vigorously summed up thus by Canon Quick, one of the most outstanding of our living theologians :

> 'The real and permanent object of Christian faith is not the Creeds, but Christ and His Gospel. To substitute creed for gospel is to go back from "the newness of the spirit" to "the oldness of the letter," and to allow faith itself to be confused with that orthodoxy of mere assent which, as St. James grimly pointed out, may in principle be shared by devils.'

So the lists are ranged : on the one side is the Church of England's conception of faith, on the other side the Roman. Unfortunately, as we have noticed, a considerable number of the more extreme Anglo-Catholics are, in this matter, on the Roman side. They share completely the fundamentally Roman mentality and outlook. It is extremely important that loyal sons of the Church of England should be clear as to where they ought to stand in their conception of faith and that they should maintain their stand with consistent firmness.

SHOULD THE CHURCH 'INTERFERE'?

By The Editor.

THE vicar and his curate were walking together to the parish church. The vicar bemoaned the incomprehensible and, as it seemed to him, misguided conduct of a prominent parishioner. The curate sought to comfort his vicar by saying: 'I expect he understands his own business best.' The vicar retorted: 'If everyone understands his own business best, there is no place for you or me in this world.' Plainly the vicar was convinced that the Church, in the person of its clergy, ought to interfere in human affairs. Admitting the Church's right to interfere, difficulties arise in deciding where and how this interference ought to take place. In our British world of to-day, the recent public utterances of Dr. Temple and some of his fellow-prelates have raised this issue acutely, but not, we believe, needlessly. Yet the problem is no modern problem. The history of the Christian religion is full of conflicts concerning this very issue. The Christian Church is apt to see its history as a long and heroic struggle to protect itself against the interference of the world, but the secularist reads the history of the Christian era as a no less strenuous struggle on the side of the world to protect itself against the fanatical and debilitating interference of the Christian Church.

The prime reason for the persecution of the Christian Church by the Roman Empire was nothing less than the conviction that the Christian religion, should it succeed in its propaganda, would ruin the Roman Empire by depriving Roman citizens of the Roman virtue which had made Rome great. In short, the Empire persecuted the Church in order to defend itself against the Church's interference. It might be supposed that the interference of the Church in the affairs of the Empire would have been most unrestricted in its earlier period. Attempts were then made to charge the Church with this unrestricted interference — St. Paul and his companions were so charged at Thessalonica:

> 'They that have turned the world upside down are come hither also; . . . these all act contrary to the decrees of Caesar, saying that there is another Emperor, one Jesus' (*Acts* xvii, 6.)

But historic research does not support this charge of unrestricted interference by the Church in its earlier days. The example of the Church's Founder and that of his Apostles offered little encouragement to such interference:

> 'Man, who made me a ruler or a divider over you?' (*Lk.* xii, 14),

registers Christ's refusal to interfere in the administration of economic justice. The narrative of the Temptation, which in the

Gospels prefaces the ministry of Jesus, teaches that the Son of God must rely, not on economic, political or miraculous methods to bring God's Kingdom on earth, but on spiritual power derived from God Himself. The Kingdom of God, for whose coming on earth Jesus taught His disciples to pray, was primarily concerned, not with the external conditions of human life, but with the interior state of the human personality.

> 'Seek first His Kingdom and His righteousness, and all these things [food, clothing, etc.] shall be added unto you' (*Mt.* vi, 33; *Lk.* xii, 31.)

These and many other instances of Gospel teaching indicate why the Primitive Church shewed so much restraint and circumspection in its interference with political and social institutions in the pagan world. St. Paul urged primitive Christians to reverence and pray for the Roman Emperors and their officials: to pay imperial taxes. He bade slaves to be loyal to their owners. Whilst he encouraged the slave to secure his legal freedom if the opportunity offered, he never taught the Christian slave-owner that it was wrong to own slaves and that he ought to liberate them. Instead, he commands the Christian slave-owners to treat their slaves as Christian brethren, and the Christian slaves to reciprocate this treatment. Whatever may have been the economic teaching and practice of the Church in Jerusalem, St. Paul's economic teaching, as a Christian apostle in the first century, seems to have been very much that of John Wesley in the eighteenth century:

> 'Earn all you can: Save all you can: Give all you can.'

Certainly, neither by example nor by precept does St. Paul support Church interference with the Empire's' legislation and administration, its politics and its economics.

When, however, in the fourth century the Christian Church became the State Religion of the Roman Empire, this non-interference policy was exchanged for one of vigorous and drastic interference in which the force and authority of the State carried out the interference policy of the Church. This interference policy, wherever the Church has secured the power, has characterized the Church's attitude ever since. There is no human institution, political and civic, social and economic, domestic and educational, with which the Church has not interfered. In the sixteenth century, in Northern Europe, the interference policy of the Church was checked to some extent, especially in the spheres of economics and politics, but a good deal less than is popularly supposed. Another great check to the Church's interference power was produced by the triumph in many countries of the principles of the French Revolution — *liberté*, *égalité*, *fraternité* — which although essentially Christian were strongly anti-ecclesiastical. In our own day, over the larger part of Europe, especially in Russia, Germany and

Italy, the interference policy of the Church seems to have been terminated by its great rival, the State.

So much for an outline of the history of Church interference. How are we to estimate its results? Would the condition of humanity in the Christian world have been better and happier if the Church had never interfered at all? This is a difficult question to answer. A study of the political, social, economic and educational history of the Papal States, where Church interference in human affairs was supreme, is apt to create a disbelief in the value of Church interference. Comparison of the political, social, economic and educational conditions prevailing in Christian States such as the British Dominions, Sweden, Norway, Denmark, Holland, in which the Church had little power to interfere, and consequently did not interfere, shews the situation to be as good, if not better, than in those Christian States in which the Church has had the power and has interfered.

In recent years in this county Church interference has assumed a different aspect. It is no longer a claim on the part of the Church to interfere in the affairs of the State; but the right of the Church to call upon the State, in Christ's name, to interfere in the affairs of the citizen to a greater extent than the State has hitherto done. This may be due to deeper insight and growing moral sensitiveness on the part of the Church to the implications and applications of the Christian social gospel, or it may be simply the Church's response to a movement for the extension of the functions of the State which has been in process in our British political world during the last hundred years or so.

It is many decades since John Stuart Mill in his *Political Economy* defined the functions of the State as the protection of life and property and the maintenance of the equal liberty of all. Yet how, if the State's functions were thus restricted, was the State's undertaking of National Education and the Post Office to be justified? Mill argued that the State was justified in educating citizens because it made them better citizens, and in undertaking public services where the State could discharge these more satisfactorily than could a private citizen or a combination of private citizens. Since J. S. Mill's time, the functions of the State have been multiplied in all directions and to such an extent that it is doubtful whether in the near future there will be any private property left for the State to protect or any personal liberty for it to maintain.

Owing to the fact that the government of this country is carried on by means of a Parliamentary party system, the latest phase of Church interference has given in some cases a partizan political character to the Church's intervention in national affairs. This partizan political character, which necessarily attaches to Church

interference in national politics and economics, should be seriously taken into account by all responsible Church leaders before they interfere. We do not say that it should prevent them from interfering, but we do maintain that only in the most needful and clearest cases should they interfere. We do not want a clericalist front introduced into our political party system, as it would certainly be as detrimental to our politics as it would be to the influence for good of our National Church.

There is, however, a tendency to gross exaggeration in a criticism of present-day Church interference in politics and economics. The Church of England, whether its bishops or its clergy or its laity, is not a united corporation, but is as widely divided within itself in politics and economics as it is in theology and ecclesiastical ideals. Ever since there were Whigs and Tories there have been Whig and Tory bishops, clergy and laity. Ever since there were Liberals and Conservatives there have been Liberal and Conservative bishops, clergy and laity. There have always been political divisions within the Church of England since Stuart times, and it is altogether for the good of both State and Church that this should be the case. We remember Bishop Percival of Hereford expressing his conviction (though it may not be recorded in his biography by his godson, the present Primate) that it made for the stability of our national life that political parties in the nation should not coincide with ecclesiastical parties in the Church but should cut across them.

As British citizens we all have, not only the right, but the duty to interfere in our national politics and economics, and no sensible Englishman denies this right to the bishops and clergy when they interfere as individual British citizens. Resentment is aroused where they interfere as the representatives of the Church. Then it is felt that they are making use of their ecclesiastical authority and privilege unfairly to interfere in politics. It is a pity when a parish priest allows his interest in and utterances concerning political and economic policies to reduce his moral, spiritual and social influence with his parishioners by alienating him from those in his parish whose political and economic convictions differ acutely from his own — and this is true for greater clergymen than the humble parish priest.

A distinguished bishop, in his recent Memoirs, deplores, on looking back over his life, that he allowed his partizanship in smaller causes to alienate friends who would otherwise have supported him in greater causes. In this Church interference issue we are faced once again with the problem of putting first things first and of deciding which for us are the first things. To some clergymen the reform of our economic system may seem to come amongst these first things, and therefore they feel that they ought to demand

it. This will seem strange doctrine to those Christians whose fundamental conviction is that 'it is in the soul that things happen' and that the primary duty of the Church is to make things happen there.

It is the fashion in some circles to-day to suggest that the method of individual influence has broken down and that the Church ought therefore to advocate political methods. If the Church plays a prominent part in supporting legal measures for the enforcement of social reforms, will she not be led away from her primary function of working for reform by the method of personal influence and conversion? Only in extreme cases should the Christian Church, as such, advocate the use of compulsion and force to secure moral ends. Edmund Burke urged the politicians of his day so to be politicians as not to forget they were gentlemen. Some of the clergy perhaps need the exhortation to-day so to be social reformers as not to forget they are Christian clergymen.

On the other hand, it will be maintained that it is not the economic issue, but the moral issue, with which the Church is concerned in these mundane affairs. Therefore, as representing the moral issue, the clergyman has a right and duty to speak. This is true, but in these difficult problems, demanding expert knowledge from those who would understand them, the advice given on the moral issue must depend on a preliminary understanding of the economic, political and sociological issues. But Church representative bodies do not as a whole possess this understanding, although individuals in them may do so.

The conclusion would seem to be that on broad issues, where the facts are clear, Church representative bodies can affirm the moral policy which the situation demands; but where the economic and political issues are intricate and involved, and the Church's representative bodies are unlikely to do good by interference, they must be satisfied to remain silent and leave decisions to the experts. Sir Alfred Zimmern, a few years ago, adduced examples of egregious misunderstanding of political problems by ecclesiastics and of the harm which ecclesiastical interference wrought in those cases.[1] Clarendon, the historian of the Great Rebellion—no mean judge of men and political policies and methods in which ecclesiastics played no small part—asserted that the clergy were, of all classes of educated men, the worst judges of public affairs. This is not to discredit the clergy any more than it would be to say that retired military officers do not make successful farmers. It is not their *métier*.

In this matter of Church intereference there is the further question: How far should the Church's interference go? Ought it to

[1] *Spiritual Values and World Affairs*, by Sir Alfred Zimmern. (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1939; price 7*s*. 6*d*.)

limit its action to the enunciation of Christian social principles and their implications for personal conduct, or ought it to proceed further and advocate compulsory legislative reforms as the needful and proper application of these principles in a Christian community?

Many years ago, Conrad Noel — a devoted clerical communist — enquired our view of the Church's duty in the sphere of social reform. We replied that our view was that expressed in Professor F. G. Peabody's *Jesus Christ and the Social Question*. As we said this, Noel's eyes flashed and he shouted, 'That book is simply devilish!' Peabody's book is concerned with the social principles and personal implications of the Christian Religion, but not with its legislative applications. Conrad Noel felt that for the Christian Church not to formulate and champion these legislative applications was really a combination of hypocrisy and apostasy.

This is the Rubicon, and we are convinced that the Church ought not to cross it and advance into the legislative sphere. Christian citizens and Christian politicians have their place and duty there, but not the Church. If the Church does advance into the political sphere she will find herself substituting the subtleties of economic doctrinaires or the deceptive crudities of demagogues for the great principles and ideals of the Christian religion, and relying on legislative compulsion rather than on the appeal to the enlightened Christian consciousness of the individual as her proper contribution to reform.

A FREE CHURCH APPEAL*

By the Rev. Prof. C. J. Wright, M.A., Ph.D., Didsbury and Hartley Victoria Colleges, Manchester.

APART from the material destruction and social upheaval of the years of war, the Christian Church in this country has been passing through a time of great difficulty, due to a general loss of nerve which has characterized the intellectual, moral and spiritual life of this nation during the past twenty years. After the exhaustion of the last war, very many deluded themselves with the facile view that they were now entitled to a 'good time.' The sense of responsibility to the future was woefully weakened. The implicit motto was: 'Let us eat and drink, for to-morrow we die.' The Church — which has transmitted the most precious heritage that belongs to the nation — was kept going by the small faithful remnant. Symptoms of this decay were everywhere, and were cunningly exploited by the twentieth-century Anti-Christ of our

* An address delivered at an Induction Service in Cavendish Chapel, Manchester.

times. On Sunday over ninety per cent. of the nation was to be found, not in the sanctuary where refreshment of the spirit and renewal of faith might be sought and life again viewed in the light of eternity, but in bed, on the golf links, in the car.

This loss of nerve made people easily sorry for themselves. They were sorry that they were called to strive in a very difficult world. Why wasn't life a bed of roses? Or a perpetual cinema show? Or, to come to one task of the Church, why had Christian thinkers such difficult problems to face? Thus, in so many realms, the implicit motto was: Let us retreat—whether to the life of ease or to the jungle, or to some 'infallible dogmatic past'; let us forget what we have received through the blood, the sweat, the tears, the thought of our fathers, and let us lay on one side this disturbing question of responsibility to the unborn future. Why should we be worried about this decaying institution called 'The Church'? There are so many other things to do—cinemas open seven days a week, golf clubs where we can solace our souls with accounts of the last astonishing round, and so on. It is hardly necessary to remind you how the nation buried its head in the sands, or concealed it in the clouds, when the twentieth-century Anti-Christ—as a Biblical thinker would call the Nazi barbarian from the jungle—was preparing his plans for the subjugation of the bodies, minds and souls of the peoples. During the seven or eight years prior to the outbreak of the war, we accomplished 'collaborations'—only they were then called 'appeasements.' In the confusion of the time good people could not distinguish between Christian ideals, lying hopes, and duping fears. In any case, disasters to humanity were perpetrated.

In the mercy of God the nation was, in a very real sense, born again about the time of the Battle of Britain. No longer do we find comfort in thinking that life is other than it is. We cease to pretend that tigers don't exist, or that they can be 'appeased' with unctuous words, or with other people's lambs. Our sons and brothers are giving their lives that this Thing from the Jungle shall be bound. They at least, with countless others, have now a sense of responsibility to the future: and, whether they know it or not, they are serving the Eternal, even if, like Cyrus of old, they do not know His Name. In a thousand and one ways—in factories, in hospitals, in the field—this sense of responsibility has been begotten in millions of people who were content, for the most part, with the personal task and the individual good. We now know we belong to one another. We belong, indeed, to humanity. Freely we have received: freely we must give. Life is more than an occasion for personal satisfactions. It has a meaning which is bound up with the purposes of Eternity. And though we may not know precisely what those purposes are, we *do* know that they involve

our membership one of another, our solidarity with the seers and saints of the past, and our responsibility to the unseen future.

The cause of Truth, of Freedom, of Fellowship in the world is God's will, and God's way, for humanity. The only worthy 'liberalism' is that which is grounded in the Living God. It must have a theological basis, or it becomes shadowy, supine, doctrinaire. Here we have much to learn from our Puritan fathers, and from such prophets as George Fox, General Booth and, supremely, from John Wesley. With all their rigidities—in which they shared with their fellows the inadequate theories of their day—they were men of iron because they were men of faith. Their lives were controlled by a sense of profound responsibility to God and to man. By the grace of God there is a spirit in our people which arises when the duty is seen. For that reason, our sceptical *intelligentsia* never expressed the soul of the nation, but only their own cynical sense of disillusionment.

> On the Sunday in September, 1938, immediately following the 'settlement' of the Munich crisis, I was preaching in a small town in central Lancashire. It was a wild and stormy night when I took the train back to College. There entered the dimly-lit compartment a working man. His threadbare coat and leaking shoes revealed that he had little of this world's goods. I can see his white and tense face now. We plunged at once into the inevitable subject engrossing every healthy and moral mind. What, he wanted to know, did we parsons think of Munich? What, I wanted to know, did he and his trade union mates think about it? This is what he said. 'Well, they've given us Peace. . . . And, I suppose, we ought to be thankful. . . . And, in a way, we *are* thankful. . . . But (after a long pause) I'm not happy : me and my mates, we're not happy.' 'Why,' I asked, 'are you not happy?' He gave me this reply. 'Because, I suppose, *there are things of more value than Peace: aye, and there are things of more value than life.*'

That Lancashire working man represented, I believe, the deepest soul of the nation : he spoke a veritable word of God.

What then of the Church's task?

If the nation is being born again, it is for the Church, by its own reality, courage, sincerity, candour, catholicity, faith, hope and love to inspire and enrich this awakening, so that it flows into channels of final fruitfulness.

The Church exists for the world, not the world for the Church. This means that we must see our responsibilities, not just in relation to our own denomination, but in relation to the *whole* life of the *one* humanity. Each of us who has the historic sense is rightly alive to his denominational heritage; and to them we must be faithful. But that fidelity is not, or should not be, a determined or pugnacious veneration for our own past. It is, or should be, an enlightened and consecrated service of the larger and comprehensive future. We need, not to bow down before the shrines of our

fathers, but to embrace their spirit, so that we become, not followers in name, but followers in deed and in truth.

This raises the question of *The Unity of the Church.* Ever since the 1920 Lambeth Conference — for which we thank God — we have been trying to translate a dim and fitful vision into actuality. We have not yet succeeded, though valuable conferences of all kinds have met, discussed and departed. The main trouble is that we have no clear and integrated view of the unity of which the New Testament speaks. 'Christian unity' is not the same as 'ecclesiastical union.'

> An old Huguenot woman was one day in converse with Archbishop Fénélon about 'The Kingdom of God' and 'The Catholic Church.' The Archbishop had driven back to her a cow that had strayed from her field. She resisted his endeavour to convert her, and he at last asked: 'Now, tell me, where was your Church two hundred years ago?' The old woman answered: *'Monseigneur, in hearts like yours!'*

Must not a very clear distinction be drawn between the *essentials* and the *non-essentials*, however important? I myself am conscious of no real separation from all who love the Lord in sincerity. John Wesley said that his followers should be 'the friends of all and the enemies of none'; by which he did not mean that they should have no convictions. He meant that our fundamental loyalty to the things of eternity should unite us to everyone who loves truth and serves righteousness in the world, and that our only fight is against the hosts of falsehood and evil.

Our main concern is for the 'one *flock*' of which our Lord spoke; not primarily for the 'one *fold*' of which He did not speak. A 'flock' is a unity, having the same shepherd, the same spirit, the same pastures. A 'fold' is an enclosing barrier, necessary to keep out the wolves, and as a place for sleep and comfort. When we think of the Church in terms of the 'flock' we shall no longer be supremely concerned with comforting one another in our little havens of refuge, or in finding shelter from the blasts of thought. We shall think of 'fresh woods and pastures new,' and be more concerned with the tasks of the future than with the securities of the past. This Johannine conception of Christian unity will deliver us from sectarian ecclesiasticism. They who are inspired by the unity of the Spirit are the true 'Catholics.'

But what is the specific service of the Church to humanity?

First, a Witness for God.

The Church exists to keep alive in hearts and minds of men the assurance of God. This universe has an Author, All-Wise and All-Good. He is the Lord of our human lives, without Whom they are impoverished, barren, without hope in the world. No furthest outreach of man's scientific faculty and research can eliminate the true God of Christian faith and worship. For evolution and order

demand an interpretation, and are never self-explanatory. It is even more true to-day than in Bacon's day that while a little philosophy inclineth man to atheism, much philosophy inclineth man to God. It is not for us to blame others here. It is for us to keep alive the flame of the assurance of God in the nation. 'The universities began,' said Carlyle, 'with their grand aim directed on Theology.' Our life begins and ends with the eye fixed on the Eternities.

Second, the Evangelical Conviction and the Evangelistic Passion.

Our Christian witness is that Christ is 'the crown and criterion' of the Divine Self-revelation. Here in the Perfect Man is 'God manifest in the flesh'—God in Christ reconciling the world unto Himself, in Paul's language; the Eternal Word incarnate, in John's language.

> 'God may have other words for other worlds,
> But for this world the word of God is Christ.'

This is the central conviction which has through all the Christian centuries inspired the evangelistic passion of the Church Universal; and has decided the emphasis of those sections of the Church to which we belong, when we call ourselves by a noble name of which, I trust, we may be always worthy, the 'Evangelical' Churches. Our 'Catholicism' is controlled and inspired by the Evangel. It is this which forbids sacerdotal pretensions and sacramental barriers among us. That is why, both at our Ministerial Ordinations and here at this Induction Service, the symbol received is a Bible, not a Chalice. Let us hold fast to the liberty wherewith Christ has made us free.

Let me quote some words from the Czech prophet, Comenius:

> 'Perish sects! Perish the founders of sects! I have consecrated myself to Christ alone.'

They recall at once the familiar hymn of Charles Wesley:

> 'Love, like death, hath all destroyed:
> Rendered all distinctions void;
> Names, and sects, and parties fall:
> Thou, O Christ, art all in all.'

Such is the authentic emphasis of every Church worthy of the great name 'Evangelical.' It is better than 'Protestant'; for that term, while enshrining an unforgettable history of Christian men's revolts, protests, and protestations, is, to many to-day, a negative emphasis. But 'Evangelical' speaks of Him who is the 'crown and criterion' of Revelation.

This emphasis gives also the other noble adjective 'Free.' To be worthy of this 'Freedom' we must be enlightened with the Authority of Truth, constrained by the Imperative of Righteousness, and inspired by the Vision of God. Only then are we delivered

from the totalitarian tyranny of the imposed dogma and the slavery of selfishness and self-indulgence. Coleridge said :

> 'The necessity for external government to man is in an inverse ratio to the vigour of his self-government. When the last is most complete, the first is least wanted. Hence, the more virtue the more liberty.'

This passion would unite us in all kinds of evangelistic enterprises in city, town, and village. Why should we wait till we have achieved a theological formula giving a semblance of 'Union'? Or till we have completed on paper some grandiose organization? Cannot the Churches *here and now* unite in evangelistic campaigns, as we in Manchester are uniting under the Council of Christian Congregations in Services of United Witness, as Christian scholars unite in theological literature, as we to-night have united in singing the hymns of the Church of all the ages?

And why — though this is delicate ground — should it be impossible for all Christian people to come together at the Table of the Lord? One of the most memorable services I myself have ever attended was at Girton College Chapel, Cambridge, on the morning before Germany launched her murderous attack on Poland. There, at the request of the Modern Churchmen's Union, and with the blessing of a Bishop of prophetic vision and statesmanlike sanity, I 'celebrated' Holy Communion with a company of fellow-Christians, composed in almost equal numbers of clergy and laity. At the close, a layman, who told me he had been brought up a Wesleyan Methodist and was now a member of the Church of England, said to me with a voice of joyful fulfilment, 'I can now sing the *Nunc Dimittis*.' I thank God for the insight and evangelical courage which made that service possible. The Union that arranged it has surely a mission to the whole Church of God.

Third, that Christianity is a Way of Life.

Our Christianity is inspired by a theological conviction, and issues in an evangelistic passion. But unless it is seen to involve a *Way of Life*, directing our personal behaviour in all the relationships of life, it is unreal and false.

Christ, who is *the Truth*, is also *the Way*, and *the Life*. These three are one. Those whom God hath joined together, let no man put asunder. This means that Christianity is profoundly and pervasively *ethical*. The good life is not an appendage of the Christian faith : it is an essential constituent of it, and, indeed, the final criterion of its reality and validity.

> O God, our Shepherd, give to the Church Universal a new vision and a new charity, new wisdom and fresh understanding, the revival of evangelistic passion and the renewal of unity : that the Eternal Gospel in Jesus Christ, undefiled by the false traditions but enriched by the true thoughts of men, may be hailed as the good tidings, and followed as the right way, of the New Age ; through Him who maketh all things new, Jesus Christ our Lord. *Amen.*

THE CHURCH AND THE YOUNGER GENERATION*

By J. T. Christie, Headmaster of Westminster School.

WHEN one is asked about the adherence of the younger generation to the Church or to Christianity, the answer is depressing and humbling. It is important to acknowledge honestly this dark side of the picture — that 75 per cent., at least, seem to care nothing about religion. They don't think about it, or talk about it: they never say a prayer or enter a church or have a conscious thought of God from one year's end to another. Of those who are confirmed, very few, at any rate of the boys, remain regular communicants five years afterwards. The ones who do are not usually — though they are sometimes — the strongest characters in the community. There is to-day very little regular Christian observance: this, I daresay, has been common among other young generations in the past. But nowadays there is not even—and this is perhaps peculiar to our own time—a vague, unreasoning assent to Christian principles, an instinctive feeling, for example, for the uniqueness of the Bible, or for the sanctity of covenants made in church, not even a certain awe of sacred things which was found even in ruffians sixty years ago. To such things, I say, there is not the same vague assent as there is, for example, to the ethics of commercial honesty or the claims of patriotism. Is this too dark a picture? I hope it is: but the verdict is confirmed by the statistics of church attendance, as far as statistics tell one anything.

Now look, on the other hand, at that small fraction of our boys who go to the public schools and the universities. Here, too, it is equally important to be truthful, even if it may sound complacent. While at school, Christian worship is a daily part of their life in which they mostly take a real and spontaneous interest. At some schools there is a 'Chapel Committee' of boys which helps to arrange services, invite preachers, and so on. Communicants are regular and sincere. From their instruction the boys can write with real understanding of the Bible or the history of the Church; and the more intelligent ones leave school with a habit of worship and apparently a genuine appreciation of what Christianity means. (Twenty years ago it was said in criticism of boarding schools that the religious services were so dull and so compulsory in nature that no boy ever wanted to attend church again. Latterly, in face of the obvious sincerity of much school worship, it is said that the

*An address delivered to the Durham Diocesan Conference (September, 1942).

standard of services there is so much above the average parish church that no boy of taste can reasonably be expected to content himself later with something so inferior to what he has known at school! It is hard for a headmaster to profit from both these criticisms.)

But the test of an education is the man's character and habit five or ten years after he has left school. Is the public school boy noticeably a better practising Christian than his less fortunate brother? In spite of the devotion and skill expended on training him to understand religion and worship, the upper-middle class boy is scarcely a whit less pagan than the others. A chastening thought for schoolmasters who watch their pupils gaining credits or distinctions in Divinity at the July examinations! At 23 how many are still regular communicants? How many say regular prayers? How many come forward for ordination?

This, then, is my point: not, of course, that the public schools manage these things better than the national system: indeed, there is often better and more progressive religious instruction at council schools than in many public schools. No, my point is that if the nation is to be recalled to Christianity—and the younger generation of to-day is the nation of to-morrow—education, in the sense of systematized school training, is not enough. Homes and churches must play their part. (I well remember hearing a speaker from India making a similar point. He had gone out on the Indian Educational Service, and at first was deeply impressed by the high culture given to the student by his education. After a year he began to know Indian homes, and realized how the highly educated youth who could write essays on the Reformation and quote pages of Milton by heart would go home, shed the whole apparatus, and revert to something very near barbarism! This is not a parallel, but intended merely as an illustration.) Improvement in religious education, though important, is not enough. It doesn't start early enough or go deeply enough. And so I will excuse myself from talking about school problems, the dual system, agreed syllabuses, etc.

As far as outward manifestations go, we are a largely pagan country, and those who have had a longer religious education seem not much less pagan than the rest. On the other hand, there is undoubtedly in some members of the younger generation more of a diffused *interest* in religion than perhaps there has ever been. There is a steady demand for books about religion: some good, like those by Dorothy Sayers or C. S. Lewis: some less good! Such books are eminently—to use the fashionable term—'stimulating.' They amuse their readers: they faintly frighten them: they warm them. Yes, they warm the engine up, but they don't let

the clutch in. There is a lively interest, but a lively interest is not a lively faith. People tend to think that this wider extension of interest in Christianity may be offset against the decreasing intensity: the butter is spread thinner, they feel, 'but it's the best butter.' I should disagree. The devil has almost as much use for this 'interest' as the angels: he knows it may give the patient just enough diluted religion to inoculate him against ever taking it properly. An editor of a daily paper is reported to have said to a young aspirant to journalism, 'Remember, the three subjects that sell this paper are Sex, Religion, Crime—in that order'!

Having now looked fairly at this aspect of the situation and vowed to preserve what Bishop Gore called ' a permanently troubled conscience' about it, we may bear in mind that this gloomy picture is no new thing. There is no period in the history of Christianity when Christians were not appalled at the state of Christendom: the better Christians they were, the more they felt it. In 1860 the Churches were much fuller than they are to-day: but read what Kingsley and Maurice have to say about the mass of men in the great cities and the Church's attitude to them. Read what John Wesley found as he rode about a so-called Christian country one hundred years earlier. Read of the ignorance among candidates for ordination that shocked Erasmus in the sixteenth century. Read what Piers Plowman writes of the arrogance of the rich and the misery of the poor in a still earlier England. And it is the same right back to the court of Constantine. In truth it goes back to the New Testament: the whole world lies ἐν τῷ πονηρῷ in the shadow of the Evil One. Fighting against huge odds is the normal *tempo* of Christianity. The Christian is always on the verge of being defeated: but never is. 'Perplexed but not wholly desperate; persecuted but not forsaken; cast down but not destroyed.' The power of apathy and worldliness is no new thing, but it is none the less, in each generation, a new challenge: and if we don't go on, we go back.

At what point then are we to start? I remember reading some interesting statistics about the religious convictions of a typical modern community, a big new housing estate beyond the East End of London where a new church had just been built. In a population of about 10,000 it was calculated that 70 per cent. had no religion at all. Of the remaining 30 per cent., three were faithful practising Church of England Christians, two were militant atheists or agnostics, and 10 per cent. were accounted for by other denominations of Christianity—another 15 per cent. in all. This left a last group of 15 per cent. to complete the tale. These had some interest in religion, and probably a background of religious training, but they were not professing Christians. They stood for

Christian 'values,' they would claim, but 'had no use for a church.'

This is the group with which, I think, the Christian evangelist must begin. Men are not converted in the mass, or, if they are, their conversion is not deep. (And here let me interpose that the Church's duty to the younger generation is emphatically one of evangelizing and converting, not just ministering to the faithful few with the sort of services they like.) We must begin with this smaller group. It often includes the intelligent members of the community and more than its proportion of youth. It is they who read Miss Sayers' books and even listen to religious broadcasts, but they are not convinced professing Christians or members of a Christian community. They are a dead loss to the Church of Christ, and they might be so much more. It is they to whom one might apply the paradox, attributed to the present Bishop of Southwell, 'What stands between Christianity and the younger generation is the Church'! There is a gulf fixed between them. What makes it? How can it be bridged?

To some extent they suffer from the general handicaps which beset the religious life of our time. First, the loss of our community sense. Owing to quick modern transport, before the war, it had no longer become necessary to know your next-door neighbour, whoever he might happen to be. We had more and more acquaintances, but fewer friends and neighbours. The parish centred round its church in the last century: that was 'the Church' for most of the inhabitants. This community has been broken up on its secular side, and the religious bond is not in itself strong enough to provide the sense of fellowship. Where there is an existing secular community, like a school, the task of maintaining a religious fellowship is much easier. The war, by decreasing transport, is already reviving this simple sense of local community in a valuable way. And, secondly, this group suffers, as we all suffer, from the increasing mechanization of life—the feeling that the soul's satisfaction can be gained by turning up a switch or twiddling a knob. Such a habit diminishes the sense of wonder, which is not only the beginning of science, as Aristotle said, but for many of religion too. And it diminishes the sense of creativeness, and smothers what Carlyle (was it?) called 'the deep disturbing sense of the living God.'

But more peculiar to the present generation are two divergent attitudes towards the Church—the first, felt by the more intellectual, that she is obscurantist; the second, felt by the more naturally religious perhaps, that she is not dogmatic enough. As to the first, obscurantism, a doctor friend of mine, while holding to the 'Christian ethic,' refused to enter a church because, he said, it was such nonsense to believe in a six-days Creation and Noah's

flood. I hastened to assure him — as I expect many members of this conference would — that a great majority of clergy did not believe in them either. 'Well,' he replied, 'why doesn't the Church come out into the open and say so? One province after another she has abandoned to the claims of science or common sense — the verbal inerrancy of Scripture, belief in literal hell fire, rigid Sabbatarianism — but she doesn't officially repudiate them; and, if she did, there are still plenty of people to protest violently.' I thought he was flogging a dead horse; but I have said things like this in public before now, and soon afterwards have usually received admonitory tracts drawing my attention to the perils of intellectual pride. Whether such beliefs are necessary to Christianity or not, many people outside the fold think they are; and for that reason distrust and dislike the Church.

And, over against that, there is a prevalent opinion among some of the younger generation that the Church should be much more dogmatic than she seems ready to be. I notice this attitude among some of the boys I try to teach at school, and I find it hard to deal with. Attempts to teach the Gospels by making the story real and living to the imagination are by them regarded as irrelevant. They want 'the faith once for all delivered to the saints.' (To celebrate Thomas Arnold's centenary, you may remember that the Editor of the *Spectator* invited articles from Rugby Sixth Form boys. One of them found many merits in Arnold but deplored his weakness on the dogmatic side. One would like to have seen the Doctor's expression if one of his own Rugbeians had rebuked him for the nebulous quality of his beliefs.) This revived demand for dogma — which is, I imagine, a gentle English echo of Karl Barth — has its dangers, if it is inimical to free discussion of difficulties, and may be symptomatic of those who, in distrust of their own powers, seek not for a God but for a dictator. The dogmatists themselves may experience no difficulties, but they are unlikely to help the perplexities of others. They will be no true evangelists, but a select group rejoicing in their own exclusive superiority.

And yet this demand for dogma has a very good side. It is a protest against the constant danger which Christianity runs of being identified with moral uplift, a danger especially strong among the English with their instinctive emphasis on conduct. If the younger generation think that you are using religion as one more method to make them good and tractable, they will reject it. The emphasis on dogma at least reminds us that the core of Christianity is the fact that God is of such and such a nature and once acted in such and such a way. Steady contemplation of that nature and that fact will bring men nearer to God than years of conscious effort at self-improvement.

If such be the temper of the more likely members of the younger generation, how are we to confront it? In the first place, I would plead for what I suppose is called the modernist approach — acceptance of the more established results of the Higher Criticism, admission and discussion of inconsistencies and puzzles in our Bible records, ready confession by clergy as well as laymen that there is much, even in the Gospel story, which is mysterious and hard to understand. We are still treating our congregations as though they were Fourth Form boys with whom one confession of ignorance may shatter confidence. But they are in the Fifth Form by now! They do not expect a 'pat' answer to every question. But, as Newman said, many difficulties need not amount to one doubt. The weakness of modernist teaching seems to me sometimes to be that it presents the Christian faith too much as though it were a series of difficulties which can be got over and a number of things you needn't really believe. Behind all, there must be unassailable conviction, all the stronger that it can afford to say, 'Yes, I know the inconsistencies of the record, I know the unchristian quality of much of the Church's history and the obstructionism of her policy, but that does not for a moment shake my conviction of the love of God and His revelation in Jesus Christ.'

I would plead also for more latitude and experiment in the worship of the Church : services variously compounded or grouped round a central theme (the B.B.C. has given a good lead here), and explanation of Psalms and Lessons. The more experienced a Christian you are, the less probably you will like such variations, and the more adequate you will find the liturgy. But we must in this respect 'become all things to all men, if by any means we may gain some.' In any case, such experiments would not be at the expense of tradition. At some churches the traditional service would be maintained all the time, and at all churches some of the time. But that leaves room for experiment. There will be plenty of criticism from the faithful few. But what the conservatives think has been hallowed for centuries was often the modernism of 1870 — Hymns A. & M. and the dear old evening service! I am not suggesting that such devices to introduce change are in themselves enough; but they can succeed where tradition fails. They are what a friend of mine vulgarly describes as a 'tin-opener.'

An old-fashioned definition of the teacher's task divides it into three stages, given by the three Latin words, *placeo*, *doceo*, *moveo* : I interest, I instruct, I inspire. The stage of interest (*placeo*) is essential for youth, but it is only a preliminary. There must be also *doceo*, solid instruction in the facts, and particularly the historical facts, of our faith. This is the point at which we can meet our friends who demand more dogma. The ground of dogma, and

also the safeguard against its abuse, lies in a sense of history. All dogmas, even such fundamental ones as the Doctrine of the Trinity, were formulated to satisfy men's spiritual experience of God over a period of time, even though when formulated they have a philosophical significance independent of their historical origins. The younger generation, with all its acuteness, is deficient in a sense of historical perspective. Some of them, in their indiscriminate adherence to dogmas regardless of their history, remind one of the Winchester boy who thought every school practice less than five years old (a school generation) was a horrible innovation; anything older was William of Wykeham's own invention. Here there is surely opportunity for the pastors and teachers of the Church in their sermons or courses of sermons; and not only thus, but in any encouragement to approach the present through the past. Christianity is above all a historical religion. Not without significance there stands at the centre of its profession of faith the name of a particular second-rate Roman Governor whom Tiberius sent out to be procurator of Judaea.

It is impossible to interest or to instruct without being interested or instructed oneself. A teacher, and surely an evangelist and a priest is almost half his time a teacher, must keep his own mind receptive and fluid — like a running river, said Thomas Arnold, adding in a memorable phrase, 'it is ill drinking out of a pond.' One must read, solidly and methodically, even if it is only twenty minutes a day. 'No time,' is the objection. I often make that excuse to myself. I wonder if it is true. Nothing is more striking when one reads biographies of the men of the last century than the methodical study of their days. An hour's reading before breakfast was not the exception : it was common. A North-country clergyman, afterwards a well-known Bishop fifty years ago, regularly bade his family good-night at 9.30 and read till 11.0 with a notebook at his side. We must learn to go on learning if we would teach others.

If this is true of the *doceo* stage, it is more than ever true of *moveo*. If you would inspire others, you must be inspired yourself : but here it is a less conscious process. The deeper and more unconscious it is, the more effective it will be. How are we to set about achieving a state of mind which is to be effective and contagious, and yet not the result of conscious strain and effort? Here we approach the whole question of the religious temper, and heaven knows how unqualified I feel to speak about it. The beginning and end and heart of religion is contact with God, not *for* any purpose, not even to make ourselves better men, but simply because He is Creator and we are creatures. Religion has succeeded with even the most unlikely people when it has preserved that temper : it has

disappointed its followers when it has forgotten that. Without the sure sense of God as a fact, as *the* fact, as something given, no careful organization, no ingenious syllabus, no Youth Movement, can finally win the world for Christianity or bring peace to individual hearts. With it, the most obscure lives have an absolute worth and can be potent factors for evangelism, however little their power is recognized by its possessors. While I was preparing these remarks, I was struck by a passage in a novel I was reading at the time. The heroine, Mother Superior of a convent school, looked out through her window at the old ill-educated Sister whose job it was to tend the kitchen garden. She said little, this old nun, but she was near to God, and everyone knew it. 'That is the way to be a Christian,' said the Mother Superior to herself; 'to become, through sheer understanding of the sole perfection, patient, tolerant, unselfconscious.' That puts my point better than I can. Against that wide, overshadowing background our problems assume a new and different proportion: our own problems and those of the Church.

Let me, in conclusion, take one such, a practical problem concerned both with the younger generation and with the Church: the lack of suitable ordinands and the lack of tradition and cultivation among many who are ordained. I make no apologies, as a layman, for raising the question: it is one which closely concerns the demands which laymen make upon the clergy and what they expect of them. This lack of education among ordinands is complained of by people — clergy and laymen — who expect a parson to be someone of a certain social tradition: 'nice fellow; comes from a good school; plays a good game of tennis.' These may, or may not, be qualifications which the parson possesses: they are certainly not necessary and may well be a handicap to him in many of his duties. Someone once said to Dick Sheppard: 'You know, Dick, what's wrong with many parsons nowadays is that they're, frankly, cads.' Dick Sheppard replied: 'Yes, I know; what we want, though, is a few more inspired cads, like the Apostles.' The history of the Christian Church surely shows that her best servants, not only the saints and heroes, but the faithful legionaries too, have been drawn from every grade of rank and wealth. The men and women to whom Paul wrote, calling them saints of God and faithful brethren in Christ, were in the eyes of the world a handful of crossing-sweepers.

Is it perhaps true that other branches of the Christian Church have been quicker to recognize this than the Church of England? Other Churches do not cast about to draw the educated classes 'into the Church'—as if we were not all in the Church at baptism—but they try to take everyone with any sign of vocation and to give him a training long enough and deep enough and wide enough

to make him, not just a religious specialist, but a spiritually well-educated man, though in superficial social ways, which we rate so much too highly, he may be deficient.

But such a training can only be founded on the conviction and the faith that what matters fundamentally is the sense of God: that a desire to know Him, to study His word, and to do His will is itself the true and sufficient basis of education. We simply are not trusting God enough if we think that a clergyman is bound to be better at his job if he happens to belong to a certain social stratum. I remember talking to a clergyman and remarking flippantly on the phrasing of the prayer 'O God, who alone workest great marvels, send down upon our bishops and curates,' etc.; and he replied, 'Well, don't you think it is a marvel that an ordinary man like me should be given this vast privilege and responsibility and power?' It is nearness to God that matters: not gifts. Some gifts may be hindrances. You remember the gifted preacher who was congratulated on his sermon by the churchwarden in the vestry: 'That's the finest sermon I've ever heard you preach, sir.' 'Just what the devil said to me as I came down the pulpit stairs.'

I hope that this digression is nearer to our problem of the Church and the younger generation than it seems at first sight. Youth is suspicious of attempts to 'get at' its heart by conscious organized exhortation. It is profoundly impressed, even more than it realizes, by the force of unconscious example. I was told by a schoolmaster much older than I, to whom I owe much, that by far the strongest religious influence of his schooldays was the unconscious demeanour of a master who happened to kneel next to him for one year in the school chapel.

We ourselves shall never see the results of our efforts to live the Christian life. But one of the most insidious temptations of well-intentioned men is to look for quick returns. We must do our best to sow and water: it is not for us to give the increase. We may bear in mind the pregnant words of St. Augustine: '*Deus patiens quia aeternus*.' 'God can wait: he has all eternity.'

BOOK REVIEWS

AN EMBROIDERED BIOGRAPHY*

In the darkest hour of Hugh Richard Lawrie Sheppard's life he exclaimed that he could never preach again because he could no longer preach Love, but his friend and biographer checked him with the words 'You will preach Truth.' This is the most prescient remark which the biographer makes, and we wish that he could both have maintained the level and have himself always been careful for truth. We also wish that the 'Life' could have been more 'Synoptic' and less 'Johannine.' There is in fact far too much of Mr. Ellis Roberts in this book, too much of the desire to interpret and correct his

* *H. R. L. Sheppard*, by R. Ellis Roberts. (John Murray. 15/-.)

hero. Whole pages of soliloquy and imaginative picturing, written in ecclesiastical and other journalese, make wearisome and irritating reading. Mr. Ellis Roberts writes his story round the theme of a divided personality, the shrinking Lawrie Sheppard and the compensating Dick. The tone of the book is revealed in phrases like 'the ridiculous deanery of that clever man Inge' (made to appear as one of Sheppard's soliloquies), and such conventionally malicious clap-trap as that Modern Churchmen 'would all do far better than "satisfy the examiners," but would never satisfy the soul who was longing for a real, living approach to God' (p. 270). There are some modifying passages about Dean Inge, but a sentence (with reference to St. Paul's Cathedral) like 'great scholars were apparently no longer great preachers' suggests that the biographer suffers from inability to appreciate the life of the mind and must be a stranger to the expansion of the heart which comes from illumination. Nor can he know anything of Dean Inge's contribution to mysticism and the life of devotion.

It is however in a misrepresentation of the Bishop of Birmingham that Mr. Ellis Roberts exceeds himself:

> 'When Dr. Barnes made his typically silly suggestion to subject the Reserved Host to chemical examination, Dick (and here he had Dr. Inge with him) immediately saw the astounding irrelevance of the proposal. Yet quite a number of 'Modern Churchmen' thought it rather clever.'

Dr. Barnes made no such suggestion, and the statement that he made it is as silly as it is libellous. The following are the words which Dr. Barnes actually used:

> 'If there were a *physical* change in the bread, chemical analysis would enable us to detect it. All are agreed that this type of change does not take place. Yet if there be a *spiritual* change, it must surely be possible for a man to recognise it by his spiritual perception.' (Sermon in Birmingham Parish Church on Oct. 6th 1927).

> 'These tests, of course, would be psychological, not physical or chemical. We must test "holy matter" by the reaction of a human being and not by a galvanometer or chemical re-agent.' (*Should such a Faith Offend?* Note p. 267).

Perhaps Mr. Ellis Roberts would like to know that a distinguished Roman Catholic, Dr. Algar Thorald, claimed that such a test was successfully carried out with a 19th century mystic; but the mystic was in ecstacy and no one seems to have sought even an approximate victory over Dr. Barnes by adducing the instance.

In view of the inaccuracy of Mr. Ellis Roberts' allegation against the Bishop, we doubt too whether either Dr. Inge or Dr. Sheppard expressed the views assigned to them since all three had so much in common. Indeed no greater honour can be done to the beloved and 'impatient parson' than to include him in their company. And no worse *gravamen* can be brought against the Church of England to-day than that it has refused to listen to all three, as each in his own distinctive way has borne witness to the need for a New Reformation.

A sporadic religious revival did indeed take place (indicating what might be possible in this country) in the heyday of Sheppard's vicariate at St. Martin's, the secret of which is revealed in one of his sermons (p. 91):

> 'I stood on the west steps, and saw what this Church would be to the life of the people. There passed me, into its warm inside, hundreds and hundreds of all sorts of people, going up to the temple of their Lord, with all their difficulties, trials and sorrows. I saw it full of people, dropping in

at all hours of the day and night. It was never dark, it was lighted all night and all day, and often tired bits of humanity swept in. And I said to them as they passed: "Where are you going?" And they said only one thing: "This is our home. This is where we are going to learn of the love of Jesus Christ. This is the Altar of our Lord, where all our peace lies. This is St. Martin's."'

And from this Temple of Love flowed many kinds of experiments, the congregation supporting the Vicar enthusiastically because he had the indispensable qualities for an innovator, *viz.* of being known, loved and trusted. There were, for example, special services for the congregation, for casual passers-by, for broadcasting, for soldiers, and for actors and actresses arranged by themselves. There was a lunch club for business women, a girls' hostel, a hostel for unemployed men and boys, the organisation of winter help for hospitals and other charitable institutions, a library, a 'St. Martin's Review.' It was Dick too who started the 'Life and Liberty' movement in the Church, which later brought him much misery. And during this time he wrote his burning books, 'The Human Parson' and 'The Impatience of a Parson,' which reveal him as combining his reforming zeal with both new truth and tradition, which is of course the essence of Modernism. He welcomed truth from any quarter, and owed most, intellectually, to the Baptist T. R. Glover and the Unitarian L. P. Jacks. And he took a generous interest in the experiments of others. The author of this review remembers gratefully the blessing invoked by Sheppard on the use of the Harborne Rite at the inauguration of Services of Inter-communion on Maundy Thursdays in which Nonconformist Ministers and Salvation Army lady-evangelists take part. But all this vital side of Sheppard's mind and life Mr. Ellis Roberts glosses, being much concerned to make him out a good Catholic, which he undoubtedly was, but in the biggest sense.

We recommend Mr. Ellis Roberts' 'Life' as a source in which *some* light is thrown upon Dick Sheppard. It contains much that is genuine and revelatory of a great soul whose story is progressively heartbreaking. Perhaps Mr. Ellis Roberts, who certainly loves his friend and desires to do honour to his memory, will one day rehabilitate himself in the eyes of conscientious historians by himself picking out the wheat from the chaff. And among the chaff we trust will be found the childish story of how Dick Sheppard, while carrying the Primatial Cross in York Cathedral, extracted the Archbishop's permission to play golf with his butler.

R. D. Richardson.

DELINQUENT CHILDREN*

Mr. John Watson is a successful chairman of one of London's juvenile courts and last summer gave a highly stimulating broadcast about delinquent children and how to deal with them. But when he puts his ideas in a book, he is inviting criticism. For instance, Mr. Watson writes:

'. . . Social and mental background, poverty and slums, disease and drink, immorality, indifference to religion, each of them conducing to that most tragic of all a child's afflictions — a broken home. These are the roots of evil.'

Every item on this list has some bearing on child delinquency, but only the first is a 'root.' More accurate was Dr. Charles Goring of the prison service. His vast investigations of convicts and prisoners resulted to his surprise in the conclusion that he had 'found relatively small influence of environment,' and that 'heritable constitutional conditions prevail in the making of criminals.' This is as true to-day as when Dr. Goring wrote, but Mr. Watson does not appear to realise it.

* *The Child and the Magistrate*, by John A. F. Watson. (Cape. 10/6. 1942.)

Another factor which Mr. Watson passes lightly by is the unwanted births. Mr. Watson must know, working as he does in Southwark, that the vast number of large families (mostly Roman Catholic), where the last births were accidents of nature, is the 'root' of much crime by children. Modern psychology has taught that a feeling in a child of having been unwanted, even an unconscious feeling, can mar a child for life. As Dr. Goring wrote, 'We find the criminal to be unquestionably a product of the most prolific stocks.' Mr. Watson knows this perfectly well. He should have emphasised it, regardless of criticism from Roman and Anglo-Catholics.

Apart from these serious blemishes, Mr. Watson's book is valuable and should be read by all magistrates who take upon themselves the heavy burden of deciding the fate of criminal or neglected children.

In the practical administration of a juvenile court Mr. Watson is at his best. One agrees here with almost everything that he writes. But his talks to his cases, as recorded in this book, read a little stiffly and his sentences are too long. Could a child understand the following:

> 'But at this stage if there is anything the officer has said which is untrue, or anything important he has left out, you may ask him any question you like about it'?

'At this stage' will conjure up in a child visions of cinemas and theatres. In fact, it is impossible to explain, so that a child can understand it, that grossly exaggerated and often meaningless right to cross-examine. The best course in such cases is frankly to say, 'You can ask this policeman questions but you would much rather wait till you can tell me your story, wouldn't you?' Our system of criminal trial was invented for cases where counsel conduct the cases and juries decide them. It is utterly unsuited to a juvenile court, even to an adult magistrate's court.

Mr. Watson is excellent in denouncing the magisterial dais and the right given by law to those over fourteen to have most of their cases tried by a jury. These traditional relics should be swept wholly away, and not only in juvenile courts. In another part of the book also Mr. Watson is especially sound; he wants magistrates to train themselves in their work. But here again this applies to all magisterial courts. The time is long past when the retired major, the elderly labour leader or wife of the country squire are fitted to administer justice without serious study and several attendances at several kinds of court before they preside in their own court. J.P.

VOICES FROM THE PROTESTANT UNDERWORLD

'Men,' says Professor Rogers, 'have always wanted to know the future . . . And they have always been disappointed.' This frustration of their hopes is inevitable. 'The future does not exist yet, and therefore cannot be told.' At least this is so in the case of Man and his affairs, since Man has Free Will. 'Sir,' said Dr. Johnson, 'we *know* our wills are free and *there's* an end on't.' Perhaps Professor Rogers is a little too dogmatic here. There is the question of the evidence for precognition and clairvoyance and kindred supernormal faculties; also the difficult question of the nature of Time. Perhaps Dunne's 'Serialism' merited some attention. Also, the question of free will is not so easily disposed of. After all, Dr. Johnson's refutation of Berkeley was similarly brief, and similarly inadequate. To have devoted some attention to such points need not have involved Professor Rogers in the writing of a philosophical treatise.

But the class of seekers after predictions that Professor Rogers is chiefly concerned with in his book are certain types of Protestant Fundamentalist,

* *Prediction in the Light of History and Religion*, by Clement F. Rogers. (S.C.M. Press. 1/3.) *Jehovah's Witnesses*, by the Rev. J. M. Swift, M.A. (Mowbray & Co., 4*d*.) (1942).

such as British-Israelites, Russellites and Second Adventists. The doctrines of the first-named are familiar, and are based upon theories about the 'lost ten tribes' for which there is no evidence, upon a fantastic philology, and upon calculations based on the measurements of the Great Pyramid. Professor Rogers has no difficulty in disposing of all this elaborate nonsense. It seems incredible that any tolerably educated persons, as some adherents of this sect appear to be, for 'British Israelitism seems to make a special appeal to old army men,' can take this stuff seriously.

The Russellites are a millennarian sect, who are associated with the slogan 'Millions Now Living Will Never Die,' and who now style themselves 'Jehovah's Witnesses.' Russell appears to have revolted against the old-fashioned Calvinism which predestined the majority of mankind to eternal torments for no fault of their own. He calculated that the number of these must be some 142 billions, and he substituted annihilation for damnation in the case of those who were not saved. The New Age of Christ had already dawned in 1874, a date he arrived at by adding up the ages of the patriarchs, the reigns of the Kings and Judges, together with some other items. The book comprising his evangel sold 2,684,500 copies.

Mr. Swift's pamphlet deals wholly with Jehovah's Witnesses, and should undoubtedly be read for the light it sheds on the mentality of some sections of a modern literate but uneducated community. Russellism could scarcely have succeeded so well elsewhere as in America, though Jehovah's Witnesses do not do badly in Great Britain. Perhaps conditions of life in a modern industrial community have something to do with the success of this sort of millennarian illuminism; since if in this life you are a standardized unit it is some compensation to know that you are one of the very few who will reign in the new world as the chosen of Jehovah.

Professor Rogers and Mr. Swift both realise that this Millennarianism rests on a false view of the Bible and its inspiration. 'It is not difficult,' says Mr. Swift, 'for a plausible writer to commend his own interpretation of passages to uncritical readers who have little or no background of knowledge and who are ignorant of the findings of Biblical scholars.'

> 'Men always want an infallible authority,' writes Professor Rogers. 'They like to be told what to think and to feel certain that they are right . . . Modern exponents of Millennarianism nearly always start with some such statement as "The Bible is True" or "We believe the Word of God" and often abuse those who differ from them in what they mean by this, calling them "Modernists" or "Higher Critics," rather than in explaining why they differ and in what they think they are wrong.'
>
> 'Too often they recognise no degrees of inspiration, but in talking about "the Bible" put the Old Testament and the New, the Sermon on the Mount and the Jewish ceremonial law, . . . all on one level. . . . They start with preconceived theories and then hunt for texts to support them.'

This is true of others besides ignorant and fanatical Millennarians, and the cure, education, is a difficult one to apply.

> 'The Bible must be read with judgment. It must be read continuously, with an open mind to notice coincidences and contrasts . . . The Bible as a whole must be studied as God's revelation of Himself to men, not as a sort of cross-word puzzle to find hidden messages in a mass of irrelevant matter.'

We have already suggested a possible addition to Professor Rogers' book in the way of a philosophical chapter. Another useful supplement might have been a simple chapter on apocalyptic literature. It could have been shown what were the conditions that produced such literature, and

exactly how much value should be attributed to it. It might have been pointed out that all such literature is pseudonymous, and that the two Christian Apocalypses in the New Testament—the 'Little Apocalypse' of Mark and the book *Revelation,* are no exceptions. The inclusion of the latter book in the Canon was a matter of some dispute, and perhaps it is a pity that it was included at all, for apart from the last chapters, it seems almost pathological, and much of it is positively revolting.

Both these small books are worth buying, Mr. Swift's for entertainment value alone is well worth its fourpence—a fifth of the price of a cinema seat.

J.C.H.

QUADRILATERAL CHRISTIANITY*

Dr. Sparrow Simpson's case is set out in his introduction:

> 'The danger is that individuals or local groups, in their longing to unite, may attempt to unite on a form without a meaning; or to employ ambiguous expressions liable to be understood in different senses; or to make concessions which their own accepted principles do not rightfully admit. Concessions have in our own time been made by adherents of the Episcopate which the principles of a Divinely-intended constitution have never yet been understood to authorise, and cannot consistently admit . . . The obligation imposed on the episcopal and priestly constitution of the Church is the maintenance of its own identity.'

Part I discusses the development of four 'principal characteristics,' Scripture, Creed, Eucharist and Ministry, in the pre-Reformation church, Part II their place in Anglican theory and Part III some recent movements towards reunion, especially the S. India scheme. The 'form without meaning' to which he most objects is an episcopal constitution without the theory of sacrificial priesthood perpetuated by apostolic succession.

Some of my criticisms are but commonplaces to those who do not share the author's views.

(i) Considering the importance to his argument of the proposition, 'the eucharist is a sacrifice,' he makes little attempt to explain or prove it. A few pages (45-55) of miscellaneous citations will not convince those who do not regard the theologians or traditions quoted as authoritative. The only other argument seems to depend on the dangerous transition from the adjective *sacrificial* to the noun *sacrifice* on page 48. Most Christians would agree that, through its association with the Cross, the eucharist is sacrificial. One might, but need not, infer that any celebrant, however appointed, is *ipso facto* priestly. But it does not follow that it is, in the full technical sense, a sacrifice, nor that its minister must be technically (*e.g.* in the Roman sense) a priest, ἱερεύς. And unless he can establish this, Dr. Simpson's argument largely collapses.

(ii) It is impossible to discuss the general question of Apostolic Succession now. Only its application to priesthood is vital to this book; and here the author needs watching, for he glides over the difficult transitions from authority to grace of orders, from succession in one see to succession by chain of consecrators, from presbyter-bishop to monarchical bishop and from presbyter to priest. Notice, for instance, the suggestion (pp. 8-10) that Ignatius speaks of bishops, *priests* and deacons; or the passage on page 47 from 'the third condition required for the celebration of the Eucharist is a qualified *minister*' to 'why was this ministry of a *priest* held indispensable?' Again, some words of Gore, 'that the principle of the succession in the Ministry from the Apostles is as essential a part of the Divine plan as the Creed' are used to support the view that the maintenance of the Episcopate

* *The Ministry and the Eucharist,* by W. J. Sparrow Simpson, D.D. (S.P.C.K. 1942. xi+215 pp. 6/-.)

and the priesthood was divinely guided, as if every argument for the value or necessity of apostolic succession were equally valid for priesthood. Similarly, (p. 126) a reference of Lambeth 1930 to Divine intention in the historical continuity of the Episcopal Ministry is used to support insistence upon Episcopate *and priesthood* as an indispensable condition of reunion (also p. 153).

(iii) What view Dr. Sparrow Simpson takes of the seat of authority is not clear to me. First he exalts the authority of the Church which, since it selected the scriptures and 'gave them the position which they hold,' is 'their keeper and their interpreter and the authority in controversies of the Faith.' He attributes to the Holy Spirit the agreement of the churches before the Reformation (but did not the whole church once awake to find itself Arian?). Relying on His guidance, the Church could change New Testament baptismal practice, including its minister (p. 39) — but not the minister of the eucharist. The Church could choose the Scriptures up to about 390 — but cannot alter the canon now, and is somehow bound by Scripture. A monarchical episcopate was developed, and must be maintained — but the monarchical papacy is not binding. He cannot be blamed for failure to solve the great problem of the relation of the living church to the given revelation, but I think he adopts, if unconsciously, whatever position best suits his successive arguments. If allegiance to scripture helps, let scripture rule; if approximation to unanimity impresses, let the Vincentian canon step forward; if change is desired, trust the Holy Spirit. Brevity shapes criticism more sharply than is just, for Dr. Sparrow Simpson is doubtless trying to weld together these different authorities; at least, these are the arguments which his readers must watch. In brief, is it asserted that Scripture clearly proves the necessity of a priest ordained by a bishop in Apostolic Succession, or that from c. 180 to c. 1500 the Church usually so expounded Scripture, or that, in the same period, the Church in its own authority decreed that it should be so? If the first, he should have paid more attention to Scripture and its correct exegesis. If the second, is it argued that patristic and mediaeval interpretation was correct simply because unanimous (if it was)? If the third, the Church could make changes after 1500. Is it so certain that the Holy Ghost only works through majorities, or had nothing to do with the Reformation?

I am not arguing that changes should be rushed or need no wide support. Many of Dr. Sparrow Simpson's practical warnings are wise, even if too cautious. But I cannot see that the ultimate bases of his argument are sufficiently consistent or made sufficiently clear to his readers. His discursive learning is therefore a danger to the unwary. S. L. GREENSLADE.

JESUS CHRIST: NOT A MYTH BUT A SHADOW*

Sainte-Beuve said of Renan's *La Vie de Jésus* that Renan had offered Jesus a seat at the summit of humanity on condition of his abdication from the throne of God. Adherents of the Christ myth school reverse this. They offer Jesus a prominent place among the gods, in company with Demeter, Dionysus, Osiris, Attis and Mithras, on condition of his abdication from the sphere of history. F. C. Bauer asserted that the Jesus of the Gospel was the creation of a primitive evangelist in the first half of the second century. Kalthoff explained Christianity as a social movement initiated not by an historical figure but by the early Christian community as a whole. H. J. M. Robertson and Drews propound the theory of a pre-Christian Joshua (Jesus) cult, and resolve the figure of Jesus and the gospel events into a *pot-pourri* of myths. W. B. Smith equates Jesus with Yahweh and reduces the gospels to symbolic allegory. More recently Couchoud has taken up the

* *Jesus not a Myth*, by A. D. Howell Smith. (Watts & Co. May, 1942. 15/-.)

tale and finds in Christianity a great religious creation which arose in the context of the mystery cults. Jesus is the name of a god transformed in the second century into the name of a man, and unknown as a historical person until then. It is for Couchoud philosophically impossible for the conception of the God-Man, the saviour of the world, to have originated in any event of history, no matter what kind.

Mr. Howell-Smith in the book under review* has surveyed the whole field with a commendable detachment. There is a touch of naivety in the author's preface in which he informs us that he is not a professional scholar

> 'but he has had something of a theological training, being the son of a clergyman of the Church of England, whose calling he once hoped to follow.'

While not disclaiming the title of 'Rationalist' Mr. Smith suggests that 'humanistic mystic' would better describe his 'cosmic outlook.'

All too often writers of the mythicist school create the impression that they work from pre-concieved conclusions with a grudge against Christianity which vitiates their historical and critical judgment. When professing Christians rebut these arguments the bias may be thought to be the other way. The merit of this book is that it comes from the 'secularist' camp. The author cannot be accused of having any axe to grind.

The argument throughout is restrained. The mythicist's case is considered sympathetically but the more extravagant arguments and blunders are exposed. Mr. Smith's estimate of Robertson's work is given in the following passage (page 53):

> 'For the circumspect student Robertson's various works on Christian origins possess considerable value as storehouses of data for the study of comparative religion, and his insistence on the importance of the pagan factor in the shaping of the New Testament was much needed. That he has been able to throw light, in certain instances, on the evolution of the gospel stories may be gratefully affirmed; but that he has woefully erred in some of his conclusions is equally patent.'

W. B. Smith's astonishing theory that primitive Christianity was an elaborately camouflaged monotheism, Jesus being the *alias* of Yahweh, is carefully examined and disputed, as is also the same writer's attempt to resolve the Gospel of Mark into an allegory. Mr. Howell Smith writes (p. 93):

> 'Even in the earliest Gospel we are removed by several stages from the original tradition. The relative lack of biographical verisimilitude can thus be explained, and does not demand the denial of an historical nucleus, even if we can never be sure what that nucleus is.'

Couchoud's position is also assailed. A cautious examination of the Pauline Christology leads Mr. Smith to refute Couchoud's contention that Paul could never have regarded the Crucifixion as an historical event, or have rendered divine honours to a man.

The negative side of the book is better than the positive. Mr. Smith has shown that the works of the mythicist school offend every principle of philology, comparative mythology and of textual criticism. But he himself is guilty of an extravagant piece of conjecture in discussing who followed Jesus at the betrayal. He writes (pages 102-3).

> 'A possible explanation is that here we have to do with a lost or not yet discovered fresco in one of the Catacombs. A scene from the life of Jesus, in a setting of the Old Testament types of the Saviour, like Moses, Daniel, Joseph, would be quite in the vein of early Christian symbolism. Suppose the central group represented the Arrest in the Garden of Gethsemane, and that among the Old Testament types in the immediate

neighbourhood was shown Joseph fleeing from Potiphar's wife and leaving his garment in her hands. A defacement of Potiphar's wife might leave it uncertain to a spectator whether a male or a female was intended, and the fleeing youth, especially if the artist was clumsy in his spacing, might be mistakenly regarded as belonging to the central group. Hence might well arise the idea that one of the men among those who came to arrest Jesus had stripped of his garment a youth who was standing by. It is true that the spoliators were a number of "young men" (νεανίσκοι), if we follow the reading of certain manuscripts. But possibly a misinterpretation of the fresco might create the impression that the seizer of the garment had assistants, or the multiplication of a single spoliator might be the fruit of rumour.'

When Mr. Smith has established the historicity of Jesus it is a very attenuated figure of whom little can be known with certainty. In his last chapter entitled 'The Gospel Legend' he writes (page 179).

'Myth, historical facts (often distorted), symbolism, and didactic fiction are so blended that we can seldom, if ever, be sure of what was said or done by the Founder of the world's greatest religion. Jesus of (?) Nazareth, a wandering Galilean teacher, proclaimed the coming of the Messiah's reign, taught his fellow countrymen to love God as their heavenly Father, was very kind to the poor and pleaded their cause against their oppressors in the spirit of the Hebrew Prophets, whose teaching had sunk deep into his soul, healed many sick persons and soothed madmen (those 'possessed with devils'), and finally aroused the hatred of the Jewish hierarchy, who handed him over to Pontius Pilatus, Protector of Judea, to be crucified as a rebel against Rome. It seems reasonable to believe as much as this. Much more may be true, at least in respect to the teaching of the Master (as reported by the Synoptists); but here we enter the region of endless controversy.'

It will be seen from the above quotation that Mr. Howell Smith takes a radical if not sceptical view of the gospels. On the subject of miracles he baldly states (page 190).

'The miracles of Jesus meet with incredulity from the modern mind. Even orthodox Churchmen are anxious to explain them away.'

The fact surely is that there is a mighty army of orthodox Churchmen hanging on to them like grim death. In this final chapter he discusses many familiar problems, the birth narratives, the birth place, the miracles, the institution of the Eucharist, the trial, the crucifixion, the messianic claims, and the teaching of the Kingdom of God. But it is all far too scanty to be of much value. Here is Mr. Smith's conclusion of the matter (page 199):

'The Gospel story then is truly a legend. Not as a mere tissue of solar or other myths, nor as an elaborately disguised symbolism, should we view it. Symbols there are, especially in John, myths and even pious fiction. But beneath the mystical and mythical crust there lie hidden historical facts, though it is exceedingly hard — nay, impossible — to bring them all to light . . . What did Jesus really claim to be? We shall never be sure. But like the Bab and Baha 'u 'ullah, he would seem to have used mystical language about his relations with God, and when men came to ask themselves what he was they could explain him only in terms of the theosophies and mythologies they knew.'

If this is the Jesus of history there is not much to choose between the mythical and historical views. Mr. Smith claims that Jesus is not a myth, but he has rescued only a shadow of a shadow. The greatness of the Christian religion is that it is grounded in history. But it would not stand long on legs as thin as these.

W. G. Fallows.

BUREAUCRACY DEBUNKED*

The complexity of the modern highly organised industrial State involves a good deal of regimentation of the citizen in the interests of efficiency. 'Planning' and 'rationalisation' are being constantly preached and much is expected from them. This is the day of the 'blue-print,' the technician, the directing offical, the bureaucrat; the day of slack *laisser faire* is gone. No doubt much may be hoped from this state of things, but the trouble is that those who run the machine, as well as those of whom it is composed, are human, and in human nature there are flaws. It is not that human beings are lazy and incompetent, though those failings are common enough; the real trouble is that official authority puffeth up, and most men love power even more than money. Moreover the official in nine cases out of ten is a routineer, a conservative, a traditionalist, a lover of precedent, suspicious of change. For the official is lazy too, and it saves trouble to prescribe always 'the mixture as before,' to keep in the ruts. 'Officialism,' writes Mr. St. John Ervine in the pamphlet before us,

> 'is a sterilising influence on all life. It cannot tolerate dissent or change, because these imply adverse criticism of itself. The mere suggestion that change is necessary is an assertion that the bureaucrats themselves have failed to perceive the need for improvement. They will, almost automatically, resist any proposal for reform on the general ground that it is tantamount to a vote of censure on themselves.'

The individual who is not himself an official, and yet who will not submit to be a cog in the machine, is a nuisance whom the machine-minders are anxious to suppress. And yet if they do succeed in suppressing him, as there is every chance that they will, good-bye to all hope of progress, for the individual is society's growing-point. The long and incessant struggle to maintain personal liberty has been inspired, not by individual vanity or perversity, but by the creative *élan vital* itself, the *natura naturans* of Spinoza.

> 'It has been animated and impelled, consciously or unconsciously, by the knowledge that every advance in human knowledge has begun as an idea in the mind of a single person, and by the conviction that unless the right of the individual to assert himself, even to make himself a public nuisance, is preserved inviolate, ignorance must eventually prevail, progress cease, and human society decay.'

In a scientific age the reverence formerly paid to the medicine-man or priest has been transferred to the expert. But he like the bureaucrat has his failings; for as the official becomes a routineer, the expert becomes suspicious of, and in the end impervious to, new ideas which were not current when he first became an expert. Mr. St. John Ervine supplies a few melancholy instances of this.

> 'In 1787 the Lords of the Admiralty refused to make a grant to Lord Stanhope for an experiment with a steamship because they were unanimously of the opinion that it would never be possible to move a vessel without the aid of wind and tide. In 1907 the Lords of the Admiralty, who had not, apparently, learnt their great-grandfathers' lesson, rejected the offer of co-operation in the manufacture of aircraft made to them by the famous Wright brothers, because their experts — mark the word, *experts* — were satisfied that aeroplanes could never be of any practical use.'

It has been said, not, unfortunately, without reason, that the military experts, before war breaks out, and for some time after, are usually busy preparing for the last war. It has been said too that the reason why the

**Is Liberty Lost?* By St. John Ervine. (The Individual Bookshop Ltd., 1942, 6*d*.)
Reform or Revolution? A Reply to *Putting our House in Order*. (A. MacDougall & Son. Sheffield, 1942, 4*d*.)

Loyalists did well at the beginning of the Spanish Civil war was because they had so few generals. The fact is that though experts are not always wrong, 'they are wrong sufficiently often for us to beware of giving them unlimited authority,'—a demand that many of them increasingly make.

Mr. St. John Ervine makes the point which is sometimes overlooked, that the official is very often a dull fellow:

> 'A French Minister of Education on one occasion boasted that at any given moment every child in France could be heard repeating the same lesson. That is what bureaucrats admire. Such men are usually small-minded dull men who, when they travel, like to see abroad exactly the same sort of things that they see at home, though what sense there is in travelling 12,000 miles to see in Melbourne exactly what may be seen in Manchester, heaven alone may know.'

A copy of this admirable and forcible pamphlet, of which 25 copies can be had for 10/-, 50 for 17/6, and 100 for 30/-, might well be sent not only to all Government and municipal officials, but also to our archbishops, bishops and archdeacons. For as during the last war plans were laid by the Life and Liberty propagandists to make our Church 'efficient,' so also in this war we are exhorted to 'set our house in order.' A group of Sheffield clergy have ventured to publish a pamphlet, *Reform or Revolution? A Reply to Putting our House in Order,* with an admirable foreword by the Rev. G. Needham, criticising the programme of the new campaign, and offering constructive proposals in their stead.

Putting Our House in Order is in reality a commonplace rationalisation scheme as applied by big business to increase profits. Just as the banks have reduced the responsibilities and powers of the branch manager, so that he has to refer all important decisions to headquarters, so it is proposed to undermine the present secure status of the beneficed clergyman in the interests of 'efficiency.'

> 'All of us are agreed,' says the Foreword, 'that it would be a tragedy if the parson's freehold were to be abolished. We are not thinking of our privileges. *Security of tenure is vital in all walks of life provided a person is doing his work properly.*'

The writers of this pamphlet believe that machinery for dealing with the negligent incumbent already exists in the Benefices (Ecclesiastical Duties) Measure, 1926; and if 'negligence' is inadequately defined in that measure this can be rectified. Moreover, apart from this measure there are other enactments designed at least to secure suitable appointments to livings, if bishops and Parochial Church Councils would use the powers already conferred on them by law.

The pooling of incomes scheme favoured by the new propaganda does not appeal to the authors of this pamphlet. 'It savours too much of the means test.' They suggest that the principle of uniting benefices should be applied more widely, and believe that in most cases parishioners would be willing to increase the value of their local benefice. They will do this more readily than subscribe to a diocesan pool. And there is another consideration:

> 'One very grave drawback to the pooling scheme is that it will stop the flow of capable candidates for the ministry. It is the right of every man who is so inclined, to marry and rear a family. He will not be able to contemplate that, if the pooling scheme we are considering is allowed to become law. Firstly, an edict forbidding priests under a certain age to marry will almost certainly be pronounced. In any case there is something humiliating in the suggestion that a man is "granted" a certain amount for the upkeep of his family. This notion savours too much of totalitarianism.'

The person who follows a calling because it offers him a reasonable way of living, interesting work and a degree of independence is not necessarily a careerist. If the new conditions prevail, men of independent character and good education will seek other professions: but a very different type of man will feel the reduced status of the clergyman no obstacle. There can be no doubt that our authors are right in their view that,

> 'The ultimate effect of the pooling scheme will be to open wide the gates to the *ineffective* careerist. The loss of qualified men on a large scale will cause a rapid diminution of our intellectual and spiritual standard. This tendency is already apparent.'

The type of man who will prosper under the new 'efficiency' régime, because he will see nothing distasteful or demoralising in it, is the 'server priestling'—the rabble of the sacristy will swarm in.

> 'At the present time the general level of education is rising. It is a sad commentary on things ecclesiastical that the general level of the clerical profession seems to be falling. We are concerned with reforms which will stop that downward slide. Pooling would merely precipitate it.'

Moreover, there is no guarantee that increased powers in the hands of our ecclesiastical authorities will be used merely to check negligence and inefficiency. Distaseful opinions and challenging criticisms may also be penalised.

> 'For ourselves, we would much rather that a dozen clergy were allowed to slack than that one honest man should be penalised for his convictions.'

One admirable suggestion made in this pamphlet is that a better use might be made of the Church's man power. The majority of lay-readers are at present imperfectly educated, and much more use could be made of retired professional men. The present reviewer knows of one case where a retired Professor of Semitic languages offered his services to the bishop of a southern diocese in this capacity, and had them refused.

On one point we disagree with the writers of this pamphlet. They advocate an increase in the episcopate, but it is our view that there are already too many bishops. There are not enough men of the right quality to fill the sees as things are. We are against levelling down the parochial clergy, and the same principle applies to the bench of bishops.

This admirable pamphlet is worth careful study. Ecclesiastically sponsored 'new deals' or 'new orders' need looking in the mouth very carefully before they are accepted. And it is very curious that it is always the rank and file of the parochial clergy, who do all the work and raise all the money for church purposes, that are the objects of solicitous reform. We may well ask *Quis custodiet ipsos custodes?* And why should not episcopal incomes be pooled, if it comes to that?

We congratulate these very daring Sheffield clergymen; it takes some courage to throw cold water on the reforming zeal of distinguished ecclesiastical aspirants for dictatorship. J. C. HARDWICK.

HIGH CHURCH NONCONFORMITY*

Never have Nonconformist divines exerted as much influence in religious circles in Cambridge University as at the present time. Professor Dodd properly stands first, but next to him comes Dr. Whale.

Dr. Whale's book* on Christian doctrine reproduces in print a course of lectures delivered at Cambridge in 1940 to six hundred men and women of all faculties who attended them throughout. The fact that they kept the attention of such a large audience of students of secular subjects gives them an import-

* *Christian Doctrine*, by J. S. Whale. (Cambridge University Press. 1941. 7/6.)

ance all their own. While not popular in style, they are not technical. Their presentation of Christian doctrine is both modern and orthodox. It is modern because it seeks to take into account the modern conception of the world and of man: it is orthodox because it does not question the classic statements of Christian dogma and obviously assumes that those statements are still capable of expressing the relationship of man and the world as understood to-day with God and Christ. Dr. Whale lucidly expounds the modern interpretation of the New Testament as the expression of the simultaneous development of the Church and its message of the gospel, shows himself highly sensitive to the spiritual tendencies and questionings of the younger generation, and while avoiding, say, irrationalism such as that of Barth, seeks to answer those questionings by the classic formulations of Christian doctrine, stripped of technicality and expressed in intelligible prose. No better statement of modern orthodoxy for brevity and lucidity has yet been produced than these lectures. Yet their very excellence creates doubt as to how far the classic expression of Christian doctrine in any form can satisfy this generation's questionings and overcome its intellectual difficulties. Even Dr. Whale seems sometimes to use ambiguity to evade them although due allowance must be made for the need of compression in covering the great themes of Christian doctrine in so short a compass.

This is perhaps particularly notable in his lecture on man and his sin and on the atonement, where although he distinguishes original sin from 'original guilt' he does not use this distinction in his lecture on the atonement or even explain whether sin is to be defined as a consciousness of a certain condition or the condition itself. Dr. Tennant sought to explain the consciousness of sin as a consciousness of the conflict between primitive instincts and the will, caused by man being the heir of the evolutionary process. Dr. Whale reasserts the classic doctrine of the Fall which, however, he spiritualises in these words:

> 'The Fall refers (p. 152) not to some datable aboriginal calamity in the historic past of humanity, but to a dimension of human experience which is always present, namely, that we who have been created for fellowship with God repudiate it continually, and that the whole of mankind does this along with us.'

This seems to say that we know that we are not all we would like to be in our relationship with God. But this is a possible definition of sin, not an explanation of its existence. Paul's statement, however, of the atonement in terms of ransom and payment depends upon Paul's doctrine of the Fall as the historic cause of the existence of original sin. Dr. Whale has therefore to be content with the classic statement of the atonement in its most ambiguous form. 'He who knew no sin (p. 88) was made sin for me. We need this desperately bold New Testament metaphor to express the truth that the Saviour felt the fact and burden of human sin as though it were his own. He bore vicariously the burden of human guilt . . .'

These well-worn phrases call forth the well-worn questions, 'Can sin be understood as meaning all sins, past, present, and future? Are sin and guilt synonymous? How can sins be borne which are not yet committed?' and they are left unanswered.

The emphasis which Dr. Whale gives to institutionalism as an essential of the Christian life will call forth greater controversy than any other part of his book.

> 'The thought of the New Testament about redemption is as much corporate and communal as it is individual and personal (p. 127). This two-fold truth is the key to the Christian doctrine of the Church.'

By corporate Dr. Whale means institutional. If instead of institutional and

communal Dr. Whale had written social and communal everyone would agree with his statement, although of course many would add institutional as well. But Jesus never claimed to found a Church but a kingdom, which was to be known by its fruits, not by its marks. The quality of a man's social life, not his membership of an institution, was in the estimation of Jesus, the measure of the divine judgment. The Fourth Gospel viewed the Church not as a fold, but, if correctly translated, as a flock. To quote Bishop Westcott's statement:

> 'There is a great difference between the Church as a fold and the Church as a flock. In the former case the Christian's relation to the Church's organisation is stressed. In the latter case what is stressed is the relation of the Christian to Christ.'

In the former case it will be the aim of the Church to make loyalty to the Church the supreme virtue, and the growth of the Church's power the supreme aim. In the latter case the Church will view itself corporately as a disciple of Christ and aim at the Christian virtues of tolerance and humility. Dr. Whale is careful enough to indicate the exaggerated institutionalism of Rome, but he can only say of its opposite extreme — no specific body is mentioned — that if it excludes certain conceptions, it is a distortion of the whole truth about the Church. What are these conceptions? Are they a ministry duly ordained, the administration of the sacraments, ecclesiastical discipline? (p. 132). The Society of Friends are without all these things, but they certainly could not be denied the right to call themselves Christian, judged by their moral and social fruits.

Dr. Whale's contention that the Word and the Sacraments make one indissoluble unity (p. 154) — if by this he means that the Word cannot be proclaimed without the Sacraments — ignores the experience of the Society of Friends no less than that of such Christian apostles as David Livingstone and Wilfred Grenfell. While he expounds the orthodox doctrine that the Christian sacraments are means of grace for those who receive them in faith, yet he seems to imply that they are indispensable to salvation. Mr. James Gray, on behalf of the Baptist communion, has already called in question Dr. Whale's application of the orthodox doctrine of a sacrament to infant baptism. Dr. Whale maintains that it is neither an act of dedication nor a single rite effecting regeneration (p. 166), but an act of God through the faith of the Church just at that point in human life where no subjective response to it is possible on the part of the baptised individual. Mr. Gray points out that because every baptism is the baptism of a person it is no substitute for that person's response to say that the faith is that of other persons, namely, the Church.

Dr. Whale seeks to rationalise the orthodox doctrine of the sacrament as *opus operatum* by advancing the necessity of faith. The Baptist cannot be refuted in his contention that this does not rationalise infant baptism. Infant baptism can only be justified if it is taken as a symbolic moment showing God's continuing act to man's response if unbroken. The Church, *i.e.* in baptism Christian parents and godparents acknowledge the infant as God's child and God will continue to act upon the child if their faith continues in the training of the child. Dr. Whale does not face the fact of a child who was baptised but was never told it was so. These criticisms, however, are equally true of all presentations of modern orthodoxy. They presuppose that the classic statements must abide and by unconscious ambiguity and evasion compel them to answer the questions of a world which has changed beyond recognition since they were formulated. Yet Dr. Whale's lectures will exercise an undoubted influence, especially where the classic statements of Christian doctrine remain unaffected and strengthened by present knowledge. The classic arguments for the existence of God, the history of the dogma of the Trinity and the Incarnation, the spiritual value of the tradition

eschatology are presented with impartiality, lucidity, and attractiveness. In a word, they are theology without pedantry or sentimentality but theology informed with the warmth of devotion and alive with a sensitiveness to the needs of to-day.

H. C. SNAPE.

THE LIFE OF THE KINGDOM *

The term 'Kingdom of God,' or 'Kingdom of heaven,' is found ninety-five times in the Synoptic Gospels, and only twice in the Fourth Gospel. In the Fourth Gospel the phrase 'eternal life' is found seventeen times, whereas it is very seldom used in the Synoptists. Thus if the Synoptic Gospels may be called the Gospels of the Kingdom, the Fourth Gospel may be styled the Gospel of Eternal Life.

Yet the divergence is not so wide as might be supposed. While the term 'eternal life' is seldom found in the first three Gospels, the general tenour of the teaching of Jesus on 'life' is not dissimilar to that found in the Fourth Gospel. We may 'live' without having 'life,' and there is a 'life' the gate to which is narrow and the way to which is strait and found by few. 'It is good for thee to enter into life maimed rather than having thy two hands to go into hell.' 'A man's life consisteth not in the abundance of the things that he possesseth.' Indeed, in general it is Dr. Wright's view that 'there is little, if anything, taught in the last of the Gospels to which there are no parallels in the other three.'

> 'The Kingdom of which Jesus speaks in the Synoptic Gospels is an "eternal" kingdom; and the "eternal life" of which He speaks in St. John's Gospel is a life *within* the Kingdom of God. . . . If we wish to know what our Lord meant by the Kingdom we shall have to know what He meant by eternal life; and conversely, if we wish to know what He meant by eternal life we shall have to consider it within the context of His teaching on the Kingdom. The two terms are indeed complemental.'

The reply given to the 'certain lawyer' in *Luke* x was, 'This do and thou shalt *live,*' the idea being that 'eternal life' is the life of love—the objects of love being first God, and second one's neighbour. Thus eternal life is conceived of 'as a life whose essential nature consists in a relationship of loving service with the One Divine Father and the one family of needy and mutually dependent men.' Thus if the Synoptics speak of the Kingdom, they do not omit to give the teaching of Jesus on the kind of life lived therein. Thus it is an error to conceive of eternal life as 'but the life of inner quietistic satisfactions,' and of the kingdom of God as 'a kingdom of earthly loyalties, interests and ideals.'

> 'The quality of eternity belongs to the kingdom, and within the sphere of the kingdom is found the life that is life indeed. What we call *personal experience* and *social service* are thus integrally one.'

Dr. Wright has an interesting interpretation of the saying of Jesus, recorded by *Luke,* 'the kingdom of God is within you.'

> 'When our Lord said that the Kingdom was "within" He was declaring the eternal value of the human soul. All outward things have been created by mind. The universe is the creation and the expression of God's mind. So also with all other outward things. Books which we handle and read, music to which we listen, institutions to which we belong, all these are the creation of mind and spirit. . . .
>
> 'Whatever "value" these things possess is not inherent in themselves or self-derived. They are creations of mind, which both originates and recognizes their "value." This thought indwells all that our Lord says about what is good, and right, and true. Such "values" are not inherent in things: they are derived from, created by, conscious mind.'

* *The Eternal Kingdom,* by C. J. Wright. (James Clarke & Co. 5/-. 1942.)

Prophets and seers of all ages, by 'faith-sight' or insight, have seen visions of some consummation when there will be an end to evil. Such faith depends upon the belief that this world is God's world, and that His purposes cannot be permanently frustrated. As to how this goal will be reached, the Divine Rule 'comes by inward renewal, not by external coercive act,' for 'the Divine Father who *wills* that all men should acknowledge His Rule in their lives *compels* none to relinquish the Rule of Evil.' In the teaching of Jesus the consummation was sure:

> 'There would be a "coming of the Son of man." Our Lord called Himself the Son of man, thereby revealing that His Messianic mission consisted in manifesting the essential nature of man as the Divine Father willed man to be, and in inaugurating the day when that will for man should be realized.'

Dr. Wright holds that what mattered to our Lord was the eternal nature of God's Rule and not the time and manner of its consummation. The notion of time is irrelevant to the experience of the Rule of God. As to the question whether the Divine Kingdom is this-worldly or other-worldly, the final truth of the matter 'is neither in one emphasis nor the other, each has served to inspire its opposite.'

> 'The Eternal Kingdom is both a "this-worldly" Kingdom and an "other-worldly" Kingdom. These two are not distinct but complemental, not disparate but united. They are not to be regarded as "shadow" and "substance," but rather as seed and fruition. Just as the Rule of God is within the personal life, yet must be self-manifest in human society, so the Rule of God is here and now, yet is leading to a consummation in the eternal world.'

The presence of two such apparently diverse standpoints as Judaic apocalypticism and Hellenistic mysticism in the New Testament has been a matter of concern to some. Rather it should be a proof of the vitality of a religion which could absorb both standpoints. Dr. Wright has essayed successfully the needful task of reinterpreting the two conceptions in terms that can be understood to-day, and of reconciling them one with the other.

J.C.H.

GOOD AND EVIL SPIRITS *

This book, part of a thesis approved for the degree of Doctor of Divinity in the University of London, is a welcome addition to theological literature. As far as the present writer knows, it is the first thorough and comprehensive treatment of the subject in one volume, and this appears strange considering the great interest taken in the other-world and the large part played both by angelology and demonology in human life and thought. Even to-day, and to a larger extent than is sometimes supposed, men still fear the powers of the spirit-world and believe that they exercise a great influence both for good and, to a greater extent, for evil; spiritualism and devil-worship still have their votaries, and even belief in witchcraft has not entirely died out.

Dr. Langton traces the belief in spirits from the most primitive period. Many avenues have to be explored — Animism, Fetishism, Mana, Polydaemonism, and many others — and the conclusion arrived at by the author, and which is probably correct, is 'that the belief in spirits is to be traced back to a primitive consciousness that the universe was pervaded by mysterious powers which were indicated by such terms as *Mana*.'

We are just beginning to realize how important it is that in studying an idea or a doctrine we should go back to primitive conceptions, for only by so doing can many things be accounted for and the idea or the doctrine shown in

* *Good and Evil Spirits*, by Edward Langton, B.D. (S.P.C.K. 15/-.)

its true perspective. So many seem to think that this study is not really necessary for strict Bible study, though three examples, taken almost at random from the present book, will show at once how such a study can make clear many things. The first is the well-known dream of Jacob. Dr. Langton says: 'Jacob places a stone under his head before sleeping. The dream which follows he apparently recognizes as being due to contact with the stone. He therefore sets it up as a pillar (*mazzēbāh*) and calls it a *bethel,* "house of god."' Again, in *Genesis* xii, 6-8 reference is made to the 'oak of Moreh,' literally 'of the teacher.' 'There is no doubt,' says our author, 'that the allusion is to a tree which was believed to give oracles.' Then in *Joshua* xv, 7 reference is made to 'the waters of "En-Shemesh," that is, "the spring of the sun," or a spring connected with sun-worship.'

In the last four chapters of his book Dr. Langton deals with the birth and development of higher conceptions of the future life and the doctrine of immortality. The space given is not sufficient in which to treat it, and the author would have done better to leave these considerations to a second volume which is promised and which will be devoted to Bible study. Dr. Charles in his *Eschatology: a critical history of the doctrine of a future life in Israel, in Judaism and in Christianity* has already treated it in a very able manner, and Dr. Langton frequently refers to his book. But perhaps even the brief and crowded review of the subject in the present work may induce some religious teachers to pay more attention to the pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament. In conversation with clergymen and ministers of religion the present writer has sometimes been surprised at their ignorance of the subject, for which there is little, if any, excuse, as that splendid monument to English scholarship, *The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament,* edited by Dr. Charles, is available to all.

S. H. N. PILCHER.

CROCKFORD IN WAR-TIME*

Crockford's Clerical Directory, 1942, consists of a Supplement to 1941. This Supplement records all clerical changes for the year ending December 31st, 1941. Owners of *Crockford,* 1941, therefore, will thus find themselves supplied with all they need for purposes of reference. Those who do not own *Crockford,* 1941, will find consolation in the reflection that their loss is due to the war situation and not to any lack of enterprise and energy on the part of the Editor and publishers of *Crockford.*

The Editor's Preface to the Supplement lacks none of its usual pungency. Although the Editor condescends at times to correct misinterpretations of his pronouncements, he neither withdraws nor apologises for them. He calls the popular policy for the redistribution of Church endowments '*Loot*,' and he sees no reason to call it anything else. He commends the Governors of Queen Anne's Bounty for their splendid ability in handling the immense mass of additional Church finance entailed by the war, and hopes that the clergy realise how much they owe to Q.A.B. We trust the day will never dawn when this venerable and efficient body will be placed at the mercy of the Church Assembly.

Crockford rightly asserts that 'religious freedom and personal moral responsibility' have furnished the best elements in our national character, and, realising how easily these qualities may to-day be subverted, exhorts the clergy to safeguard them. With sound common sense *Crockford* realises the value of the profit motive in business but also recognises its dangers. 'Sir,' said Dr. Johnson, 'there are many ways in which men may be less innocently employed than in making money.'

H.D.A.M.

* *Crockford's Clerical Directory, Supplement to the 1941 Edition.* (Oxford University Press. 1942.)

SHORT NOTICES

Mrs. Russell in her brief work *The Path to Reconstruction** seeks to introduce to the public Dr. Schweitzer's philosophy and to summarise his philosophic contentions. Dr. Schweitzer himself expresses his philosophy in four volumes, two of which are still in preparation. One of these latter formed the Gifford lectures of 1935. It is therefore impossible to appraise or to summarise Schweitzer's philosophy from this brief introduction. This much however can be safely written. Schweitzer judged Western civilisation to be declining long before the catastrophe of this present war. Defining civilisation 'as the material and spiritual progress both of individuals and communities in such a way that for both the struggle for existence becomes less strenuous,' he maintains that the struggle will grow less intense as reason gains supremacy (1) over external nature and (2) over human nature. The failure of reason in the latter battle is the cause of the decline of modern civilisation. Civilisation, he considers, can be restored only by the restoration of thought to its practical function of discovering a satisfactory philosophy on which individuals and communities can act. As a basis of such thinking Schweitzer suggests 'I am life which wills to live.' From this he deduces the ethic of reverence for life wherever it is to be found and of a self-dedication to all other life. Such an ethic would forge a new conscience which would be ashamed even at the necessary injuries or damage to what are customarily judged to be the humblest forms of life. Mrs. Russell's book will fulfil its function of stimulating its readers to study Schweitzer's philosophy for themselves because it is written by a devoted disciple whose one desire is plainly to commend Schweitzer's thought to every man.

Branches of the Vine† by Winifred Haigh is intended to be a guide to prayer and devotion for the newly confirmed. It promises to be of practical assistance to all those who want to pray and have some idea of the purpose and technique of prayer. Its suggestions are direct and clear; its material, for the most part, is taken from the New Testament and the Prayer Book, while its spirit is free from sentimentalism and religiosity.

H. C. SNAPE.

CORRESPONDENCE

To the Editor of *The Modern Churchman*

SIR, THE WORK OF THE MODERN CHURCHMEN'S UNION

May I draw the attention of your readers to the change in the organization of the Union and ask that correspondence for the Hon. Secretary be sent to Steeple Claydon Vicarage, Bletchley, Bucks, the London office having been closed for the present.

Secretaries of local branches will assist me if they will kindly let me have their names and addresses with any information about activities, even if no meetings have been held recently. I shall always be glad to know of opportunities of helping branches by arranging for speakers to address them.

There is plenty of popular literature available (see *M.C.* advertisement), though it is necessarily incomplete, so that those who fail to find what they want in the list should apply to me for further details or let me have a note of what they desire.

Under present conditions a catalogue of the books in the library is not to be had, but would-be borrowers should write stating the names of books needed or the subjects of study, which will be forwarded to the librarian; a charge for postage will be due.

Many people up and down the country are potential members of the Union;

* *The Path to Reconstruction*, by Mrs. Charles E. B. Russell. (A. & C. Black. 1942. 3/6.)
† *Branches of the Vine*, by Winifred Haigh. (Oxford University Press. 1941. 4/6.)

the difficulty is to make our work known more widely. Papers explaining our aims and giving our constitution are sent out to any people whose names and addresses are suggested to the Secretary. Some of the Council have been active in this way to good effect.

May I also, without seeming to stress the obvious, point out the great opportunity which lies immediately ahead of us. As the night of horrible warfare begins to yield to the promise of dawn we can as a union address ourselves with courage and fresh hope to the task of fostering freedom of thought in the Church. For liberal thought is essential to the health of Christendom, and scholarship, if men will only grasp the fact, has presented us with a means of proclaiming the gospel in simple and everyday language. The student of theology may well remember Kipling's insight in 'A Dedication':

'If there be good in that I wrought
Thy hand compelled it, Master, Thine;
Where I have failed to meet Thy thought
I know, through Thee, the fault was mine.'

As the Council has provided me with some clerical help it should be possible for me to carry out the work of the Union under present conditions. In any case, please let your readers make use of me, if they think I can serve them in any way.

R. Gladstone Griffith,
Vice-Chairman and Hon. Secretary,
Modern Churchmen's Union.

Steeple Claydon Vicarage, Bucks.
December, 1942.

Sir,

THE MODERN CHURCHMAN

May I say that I very much prefer the title 'Modern Churchman' to 'Liberal Churchman,' in the first place because every churchman ought to be liberal, and by arrogating the title for ourselves we should suggest all others were illiberal; and secondly because it states clearly our *raison d'être*; we are forced by modern scientific discoveries and historical criticism to a modern interpretation of the Bible and our traditional Christian formularies.

E. E. Bradford.

Nordelph Vicarage, Downham Market, Norfolk.

Sir,

DOGMA MATTERS

I detest 'dogma'—for my experience of it in the mouths of unlearned and self-confident clerics and laymen and women is not what you mean by the word in your article, 'Dogma Matters.'

Its penultimate paragraph on p. 159 reminded me of Chapter III in Cicero's *Academica II,* which accords with a well-known later injunction, 'Seek and ye shall find,' which certainly does not imply a blind acceptance of authority. It runs: 'We followers of the Academy desire to discover the truth without any contention and to pursue it with the greatest diligence and devotion. We will never allow exhaustion to stay our zeal in the pursuit of truth . . . Nor is there any difference between ourselves and those who think that they have positive knowledge, except that they have no doubt that their tenets are true, whereas we hold many doctrines as probable, which we can easily act upon, but scarcely affirm incontrovertibly . . . we retain our power of judgment uncurtailed nor are we bound to support all dogmas (*praescripta*) imposed by various dictators.'

The word 'dogma' summons up for me an unpleasing picture moving throughout the past ages of priests with artificial professional manners learnt in ecclesiastical schools of elementary deportment quoting 'a strangely arbitrary theology poisoned with primitive savagery inherited from the less desirable parts of the Old Testament' and mingling therewith the penal codes of the early Christian Empire; 'preoccupied with torture and death for any hesitation in accepting its elaborately justified beliefs in the magic efficacy of rites and sacraments' (*cf. Grey Eminence,* p. 27).

'Dogma' implies a search perfected and completed. How wise of our Articles to assert that General Councils have erred!

Your use of the word as implying a 'working hypothesis' is just what the dogmatists will not accept. They suffer from arrested development.

Billinghay Vicarage, Lincoln. W. STANHOPE-LOVELL.
November 1st, 1942.

SIR, WHAT ARE NECESSARY DOGMAS?

I am indebted to the Rev. T. J. Wood for his courteous reply, but I think it necessary to demur that whether or no the Resurrection is an essential part of the Christian faith is the most important point in dispute, and an individual dogmatic assertion about this is hardly allowable.

The more immediate point, however, is doctrine in the Church of England, and particularly the necessary minimum. So far as I am aware there is only one authoritative statement of such doctrine, namely the thirty-nine Articles, which are now almost universally regarded as obsolete. To that extent, everything *is* in the melting-pot. The majority of modern churchmen will agree that Article 4 on the Resurrection needs revision. What I wish to point out, therefore, is that it is very unwise for individuals, whatever their position in the Church, to make *ex cathedra* utterances that this or that item is an *essential* part of the *Christian* faith. It may be an essential part of their faith, but that is not quite the same thing. We are liable to forget that things are logically connected, and that no creed can stand unless consistent with its premises. Once you have abandoned the infallible Church, other things go with it, though this is not immediately recognised, and it is foolish to assert particular dogmas as essential unless they form part of a consistent and coherent scheme.

I have been rash enough to try to formulate such a scheme, which has not been well received, but at least I may be allowed to point out that this is the main object of any sound Modern Church movement. H. S. SHELTON.

SIR,

The belief that the Resurrection ('however explained') is an essential part of the Christian faith is not 'an individual dogmatic assertion' either of the Doctrinal Commission or myself; it is the universal belief of the Christian Church since the days of St. Paul's explicit statement, *I Cor.* xv, 13-14.

Mr. Shelton may draw up a form of the Christian faith for himself which omits the Resurrection, but he cannot be surprised that it 'has not been well received.' The belief has formed part of every form of the Christian faith professing to be 'consistent and coherent.'

Mr. Shelton regards the thirty-nine Articles as the only authoritative statement of doctrine in the Church of England. There are also the Creeds, referred to in Article VIII, and surely there is a difference between re-interpretation of the articles of the Creeds and their repudiation? The former appears to be 'the main object of any sound Modern Church movement.' T. J. WOOD.

The Vicarage, Charlbury, Oxford.
November 25th, 1942.

THE MODERN CHURCHMEN'S CONFERENCE, 1943

The annual Modern Churchmen's Conference, suspended during 1940, 1941, 1942, will be resumed in 1943. A shortened conference extending over three days will be held in Somerville College, Oxford, July 26 to 29. It is hoped, in order that adequate arrangements may be made, that those desiring to attend will write, *as soon as possible,* to:

The Hon. Secretary, Modern Churchmen's Conference,
The Principal's Lodge, Ripon Hall,
Boars Hill, Oxford,

H. D. A. MAJOR.